

CAMBRIDGE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS

PROPERTIUS
ELEGIES
BOOK IV

EDITED BY GREGORY HUTCHINSON

CAMBRIDGE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS

GENERAL EDITORS

P. E. EASTERLING

Regius Professor Emeritus of Greek, University of Cambridge

PHILIP HARDIE

Corpus Christi Professor of Latin, University of Oxford

RICHARD HUNTER

Regius Professor of Greek, University of Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

Kennedy Professor Emeritus of Latin, University of Cambridge

PROPERTIUS
ELEGIES

BOOK IV

EDITED BY
GREGORY HUTCHINSON

Professor of Greek and Latin Languages and Literature, University of Oxford



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo
Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521525619

© Cambridge University Press 2006

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2006

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN-13 978-0-521-81957-2 hardback

ISBN-10 0-521-81957-1 hardback

ISBN-13 978-0-521-52561-9 paperback

ISBN-10 0-521-52561-6 paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for
external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee
that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

To the memory of Professor R. O. A. M. Lyne

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	<i>page</i> viii
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	ix
Introduction	i
1 Book 4 and discontinuity	1
2 Contemporary context	2
3 Propertian and elegiac context	7
4 The shape of book 4	16
5 Text	22
 SEX. PROPERTI LIBER QVARTVS	 25
 Commentary	 59
<i>Bibliography</i>	250
<i>Indexes</i>	253
1 Latin words	253
2 General	254

PREFACE

Propertius 4 is an outstandingly attractive and original poetic structure; it is also demanding and difficult at every level. There is room then for a new commentary. This one aspires, among other things, to give wider contexts than previously for a reading of the book, and to help understanding of it as a sequence. Limits of size have made me present only a small proportion of the material amassed in my own struggles with Propertius; they have also restricted the discussion of views not adopted here. But I hope that readers will not take briskness as dogmatism, and that the edition may perhaps assist them to develop their own ideas on this inexhaustible work.

The edition has at least enjoyed very distinguished aid. My largest scholarly debt is to Dr S. J. Heyworth: he has generously lent me, along with much else, a draft of his text of book 4 and of his textual notes. The masterly intelligence and imagination of his textual criticism have been of the greatest value to me; our not infrequent divergences of opinion are only what one would expect in such an area. The edition has profited immensely from the comments of Professor E. J. Kenney, who read some of it, and of Professors P. R. Hardie and C. S. Kraus, who read it all. (The first two acted as series editors, the last as a heroic volunteer.) Their excellent points have been gratefully appropriated; their unwearying emphasis on clarity and the consumer has effected something of a transformation. Dr I. Adams has copy-edited the book with keen eyes and tactful words; Dr M. Sharp has been prompt and good-humoured. Exeter College financed a trip to the hospitable British School at Rome, which enabled me to scrutinize various inscriptions, artefacts and sites. Dr N. Gonis and Dr D. Obbink have enabled me to scrutinize papyri. Professors E. M. Steinby and P. Zanker each helped with an item of bibliography. Ms R. Hughes and Dr Chr. Kaesser have kindly shown me some of their work. Dr R. E. Parkes ably taught and organized my pupils while I flourished in sabbatical leisure. My wife and daughter have given sound advice, and have themselves offered models of pertinacity.

With great sorrow, I dedicate this book to the memory of my former tutor Oliver Lyne. His sudden death deprives Latin studies of a unique scholar, and me of a unique friend.

August 2005

G. O. H.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>ABV</i>	J. D. Beazley, <i>Attic black-figure vase painters</i> (Oxford 1956).
<i>AE</i>	<i>L'Année Épigraphique</i> (Paris 1889–).
<i>ANRW</i>	(edd.) H. Temporini and W. Haase, <i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i> (Berlin and New York 1972–).
<i>CAH</i> x ²	(edd.) A. K. Bowman, E. Champlin and A. W. Lintott, <i>The Cambridge ancient history x: the Augustan Empire 43 BC–AD 69</i> , 2nd edn. (Cambridge 1996).
<i>CCAG</i>	<i>Catalogus codicum astrologorum Graecorum</i> , 12 vols. (Brussels 1898–1936).
<i>CEG</i>	(ed.) P. A. Hansen, <i>Carmina epigraphica Graeca</i> , 2 vols. (Berlin 1983–9).
<i>CIL</i>	<i>Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum</i> (Berlin 1863–).
<i>CLE</i>	(edd.) F. Bücheler and E. Lommatzsch, <i>Carmina Latina epigraphica</i> , 3 vols. (Leipzig 1895–1926).
<i>CPL</i>	(ed.) R. Cavenaile, <i>Corpus papyrorum Latinarum</i> (Wiesbaden 1958).
<i>ET</i>	(ed.) H. Rix, <i>Etruskische Texte. Editio minor</i> , 2 vols. (Tübingen 1991).
<i>FGrHist</i>	(edd.) F. Jacoby and others, <i>Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> (Berlin and Leiden 1923–).
<i>GLK</i>	(ed.) H. Keil, <i>Grammatici Latini</i> , 8 vols. (Leipzig 1857–70).
<i>GP</i>	(edd.) A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, <i>The Greek Anthology. The Garland of Philip and some contemporary epigrams</i> , 2 vols. (Cambridge 1968).
<i>HE</i>	(edd.) A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, <i>The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic epigrams</i> , 2 vols. (Cambridge 1965).
<i>H–S</i>	J. B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr, <i>Lateinische Syntax und Stylistik</i> (Munich 1965).
<i>IG</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i> (Berlin 1873–).
<i>IG Bulg.</i>	(ed.) G. Mihailov, <i>Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgaria repertae</i> , 2nd edn., 5 vols. (Sofia 1970–97).
<i>IGUR</i>	(ed.) L. Moretti, <i>Inscriptiones Graecae urbis Romae</i> , 4 vols. (Rome 1968–90).
<i>II</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Italiae</i> (Rome 1931–).
<i>ILLRP</i>	(ed.) A. Degrassi, <i>Inscriptiones Latinae liberae rei publicae</i> , 2nd edn., 2 vols. (Florence 1963–5).
<i>ILS</i>	(ed.) H. Dessau, <i>Inscriptiones Latinae selectae</i> , 3 vols. (Berlin 1892–1916).
<i>Inscr. Cret.</i>	(ed.) M. Guarducci, <i>Inscriptiones Creticae</i> , 4 vols. (Rome 1939–50).
<i>K–S</i>	R. Kühner and C. Stegmann, <i>Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache</i> , 3rd edn. ed. A. Thierfelder, 2 vols. (Leverkusen 1955).

- LIMC** *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae*, 10 vols. (Zurich and Munich 1981–99).
- LSS** (ed.) F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplément* (Paris 1962).
- LTUR** (ed.) E. M. Steinby, *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae*, 6 vols. (Rome 1993–9).
- MAR** (edd.) L. Haselberger, D. G. Romano and E. A. Dumser, *Mapping Augustan Rome* (JRA Supplement 50, Portsmouth, R.I. 2002).
- ML** (ed.) E. Courtney, *Musa lapidaria. A selection of Latin verse inscriptions* (Atlanta 1995).
- MRR** (edd.) T. R. S. Broughton and M. L. Patterson, *The magistrates of the Roman Republic*, 3 vols. (New York and Atlanta 1951–86).
- N–H** R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A commentary on Horace: Odes Book I, Book II* (Oxford 1975, 1978).
- N–R** R. G. M. Nisbet and N. Rudd, *A commentary on Horace: Odes Book III* (Oxford 2004).
- N–W** F. Neue and C. Wagener, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, 3rd edn., 4 vols. (Leipzig and Berlin 1892–1905).
- OLD** (ed.) P. Glare, *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford 1982).
- ORF** (ed.) E. Malcovati, *Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta liberae rei publicae*, 4th edn. (Turin 1976–9).
- PGM** (edd.) K. Preisendanz and A. Henrichs, *Papyri Graecae magicae*, 2nd edn., 2 vols. (Stuttgart 1973–4).
- PIR²** E. Groag, A. Stein and L. Petersen, *Prosopographia imperii Romani*, 2nd edn. (Berlin 1933–).
- PLM** (ed.) E. Baehrens, *Poetae Latini minores*, 6 vols. (Leipzig 1879–86).
- PPM** (edd.) G. Pugliese Carratelli and I. Baldassarre, *Pompei. Pitture e mosaici*, 11 vols. (Rome 1990–2003).
- RDGE** (ed.) R. K. Sherk, *Roman documents from the Greek East. Senatus consulta and epistulae to the age of Augustus* (Baltimore 1969).
- RE** (edd.) A. Pauly, G. Wissowa and W. Kroll, *Real-Enzyklopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Stuttgart 1893–).
- RIC¹²** C. H. V. Sutherland, *The Roman Imperial coinage I: from 31 BC to AD 69*, 2nd edn. (London 1984).
- RRC** M. H. Crawford, *Roman Republican coinage*, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1974).
- RS** (ed.) M. H. Crawford, *Roman statutes*, 2 vols. (BICS Supplement 64, London 1996).
- SC Pis.** (edd.) W. Eck, A. Caballos and F. Fernández, *Das Senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre* (Munich 1996).
- Sab. Texte** (ed.) H. Rix, *Sabellische Texte. Die Texte des Oskischen, Umbrischen und Südpikenischen* (Heidelberg 2002).

- SEG* *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (Leiden 1923–).
- SGO* (edd.) R. Merkelbach and J. Stauber, *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*, 5 vols. (Stuttgart 1998–2004).
- SH* (edd.) H. Lloyd-Jones and P. J. Parsons, *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin and New York 1983).
- Suppl. It.* *Supplementa Italica, Nuova serie* (Rome 1981–).
- Suppl. Mag.* (edd.) R. W. Daniel and F. Maltomini, *Supplementum magicum*, 2 vols. (Opladen 1989–92).
- SVF* (edd.) H. von Arnim and M. Adler, *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*, 4 vols. (Leipzig 1905–24).
- Tab. Iguv.* *Tabulae Iguvinae*, in *Sab. Texte* (above) 47–62.
- Tab. Vind.* (ed.) A. K. Bowman, J. D. Thomas and J. N. Adams, *The Vindolanda writing-tablets (tabulae Vindolandenses) II–III* (London 1994–2003).
- TLL* *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* (Leipzig and Munich 1900–).
- TrGF* (edd.) B. Snell, R. Kannicht and St. Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, 5 vols. (Göttingen 1971–2004).

INTRODUCTION

I. BOOK 4 AND DISCONTINUITY

Propertius' fourth book is a spectacular, and bewildering, creation, unlike anything else in Augustan poetry. The reader encounters a dazzling series of poems sensationally diverse in subject and speakers; the diversity is obviously meaningful rather than random. What underlies the book, paradoxically, and most generates its impact and its questioning, is discontinuity (and continuity). The introduction will pursue this subject through various interlocking areas, and in doing so will supply context and essential information.¹

Though the analysis would still obtain without attention to the abstract idea, continuity was a vital concern of ancient philosophy and literary theory; it had bearing both on genre and on Roman history. Time and our experience of it was thought to be or seem continuous. Roman history was considered an unbroken series of events from Aeneas to the present and will have appeared so in Ennius' and Livy's realizations, however each work varied in internal narrative pace. In general terms, oneness and continuity were thought to go together (i.e. discontinuity excluded oneness), even if continuity implied a division of one thing into parts. The more elevated literary genres offered, as a basis of their unity, a 'continuous and single' action (Arist. *Poet.* 1452a14–15, of tragedy), a *perpetuum argumentum*, like *Iliad* or *Annales* (Varro *Men.* fr. 396 Cèbe). Narrative sequence in these genres thus mirrors their representation of continuous time. (Narrative ellipses, analepses etc. complicate the picture.) The master elegist Callimachus claims to be faulted for not writing a work which was one and continuous (ἐν ᾅειμῳ διηγεέε, *Aet.* fr. 1.3 Massimilla). Horace implicitly contrasts himself with those who write *unum opus* . . . *carmine perpetuo* in praise of the city of Athens (*C.* 1.7.5–7).²

P.'s approach to his book and to Roman history is multiply and abundantly discontinuous; discontinuity in chronology and in reading sequence are intimately connected. Critics rightly seek connections between the poems and blurrings

¹ A list of the poems with the headings given in the commentary may offer a useful encapsulation of the book: 1 *Propertius and Horos*; 2 *Vertumnus*; 3 *Arethusa*; 4 *Tarpeia*; 5 *Acanthis*; 6 *Apollo*; 7 *Cynthia I*; 8 *Cynthia II*; 9 *Hercules*; 10 *Jupiter*; 11 *Cornelia*.

² On historical epics (surely in question here) see A. Kerkhecker in *L'histoire littéraire immanente dans la poésie latine* (Entr. Hardt 47, Geneva 2001) 60–1; in line 7 Erasmus' *decerptae frondi* has attractions. For Aristotle on continuity cf. *Phys.* 5.3 (esp. 227a10–17), 6.1–2, *Metaph.* Δ 1023b32–4; D. Bostock in L. Judson (ed.), *Aristotle's Physics* (Oxford 1991) 179–212. Cf. further e.g. Epic. 2.50.1 Arrighetti (oneness and continuity, in appearance); *SVF* II no. 948 (causes); Cic. *Ac. Post.* 28–9, Sen. *Ot.* 4.2 with Williams ad loc. (cosmic continuity, causes); Kant, *KdRV* B 211–12, 281–2 (*in mundo non datur saltus*), M. Friedman, *Kant and the exact sciences* (Cambridge Mass. 1992) 31–2, 60–2, 71–80; P. Ricœur, *Temps et récit* (Paris 1983–5) III 65–7. For some of the complications with Livy's, and Ennius', embodiments of Roman history, see J. Henderson, *Fighting for Rome* (Cambridge 1998) ch. 8.

between the types of poems; as will be seen, these are numerous and crucial. But this impulse should not make us underplay the disconcerting and forcefully conflicting elements in the book. If we represent continuity loosely by the one-way series of seamlessly joining entities *abcde* . . . , then some of the types of discontinuity in book 4 may be represented as (i) *az* (ii) *ca* (iii) *aδ*. In (i), the beginning and end of a chronological series (the history of Rome) are confronted and so maximize the gap and the disparity: cf. e.g. the conjunction of 4.4 and 4.5, or the depiction of Rome's beginnings 4.1.1–38. One may contrast the aim of ancient philosophy and modern mathematics to achieve continuity by eliminating or minimizing a gap. In book 4 the maximum gap can be combined (as in the sequences 4.3–4.4 or 4.8–4.9) with (ii), a movement against the arrow of time. (ii) occurs most dramatically in the sequence 4.7–4.8, from Cynthia dead to Cynthia living (see introduction to 4.8). It can be combined (as in 4.5–4.6) with (iii). In (iii) material of a startlingly different nature appears in a successive poem, or even within a poem (as in the sequence 4.8.1–26). It is this type of discontinuity, found all over the book, which most directly transgresses P's generic norms: for the world of books 1 and 2 is largely homogeneous, whereas narrative sequence between poems arises infrequently in love-elegy's universe of incessant but reversible change. The jump from 4.2 to 4.3 is an early example of (iii). One may indeed see in book 4 a rough underlying pattern of aetiological poems alternating with non-aetiological poems, first singly then in pairs (4.7–8, 9–10); but the conflict within 4.1 prevents us from seeing this as straightforward or unproblematic. And the crossings (4.4 ancient love, 4.6 modern aetiology etc.) increase unexpectedness without diminishing discontinuity. Book 4 is pervaded by an aesthetic of meaningful surprise.³

2. CONTEMPORARY CONTEXT

The book will not have appeared before 16 bc. In that year (4.6.77–8n.) the Sugambri, a German tribe, defeated M. Lollius (probable allusion 4.1.95–6); they were forced, however, to sign a treaty by Augustus' arrival in 16. It is to this

³ Cf. for criticism of diversity Hor. *AP* 1–38 (from Philodemus?), and also (against the author) Call. fr. 203. 15–22 Pfeiffer (*Ia* 13). On Propertius 4 as a whole see, among other work, P. Grimal, *Latomus* 11 (1952) 183–97, 315–26, 437–50; E. Burck, *WS* 79 (1966) 405–27; W. R. Nethercut, *AJP* 89 (1968) 449–64; C. Becker, *Hermes* 99 (1971) 449–80; Hubbard (1974) ch. 4; J. P. Sullivan, *Propertius* (Cambridge 1976) 134–47; A. La Penna, *L'integrazione difficile* (Turin 1977) 85–100; K.-W. Weeber, *Das 4. Properz-Buch* (diss. Bochum 1977); G. O. Hutchinson, *JRS* 74 (1984) 100–3; J. P. Sullivan, *ICS* 9 (1984) 30–4; Stahl (1985) chs. 11 and 12; Wyke (2002) ch. 3; J. L. Butrica, *ICS* 21 (1996) 87–158; Fox (1996) ch. 5; E. Fantham in T. Habinek and A. Schiesaro (edd.), *The Roman cultural revolution* (Cambridge 1997) 122–35; N. Holzberg, *Die römische Liebeslegie* (2nd ed., Darmstadt 2001) 67–75; Janan (2001); S. Viarre in P. Defosse (ed.), *Hommages à Carl Deroux* 1 (Brussels 2002) 507–14; J. Farrell, *New Literary History* 34 (2003) 399–400; DeBrohun (2003); Miller (2004) 184–9; Coutelle (2005) 539–81.

submission that 4.6.77 *memoret seruire Sugambros* is most aptly referred, rather than to their later crushing by Drusus (cf. *Epiced. Drus.* 17–18, 311) and then Tiberius. The submission is also spoken of in Horace's *Odes* 4 (14.51–2), perhaps published in early 13. The death of Cornelia is less enlightening. 4.11.65–6, which date her death to her brother's consulship, are probably spurious; the consulship is 18 BC, or less probably 16. If the synchronism of death and consulship should be correct, the earlier the poem marking her death is published the better.

Book 4 mostly confronts stories from the time of Romulus or before with stories or implied stories from the present day. The initial effect, modified by many twists and complications, is to create a chasm between past and present. This approach, though often found in Latin literature, is very different from the approach of Augustus. Augustus, though or because responsible for the largest change in Roman history, presented a studied image of innovation within tradition, which he continues and renews: so in the elaborate balances of Aug. *RG* 8.5 *legibus noui[s] m[e] auctore l[ati]s, m[ulta e]xempla maiorum exolescentia iam ex nostro [saeculo] red[uxi] et ip[s]e multarum rer[um] ex[em]pla imitanda pos[teris tradidi]*. Much that we call Augustan was to be seen as Roman.

Many of his actions bring out the joining of new and old. He restores old temples in great number, and builds new ones. (Cf. Aug. *RG* 19–21.1, App. 2–3; P. 4.6, 4.10.) He associates himself with Romulus, and so shows both involvement with tradition and a new start. Recent events show a particular concern with these questions. Augustus ends his prodigious run of consulships in mid-23 BC; his power, as he continues to make clear, must find expression in forms that are less obtrusive, and seem traditional. His social legislation (c. 18 BC; cf. P. 4.11) is innovative in its interference; but it aims at reinforcing traditional morals and hierarchies. So does his purging of the Senate (18 BC). The *Ludi Saeculares* of 17 BC mark a 'new age'; but the age is one in a series. The ceremony is to seem traditional. (Cf. the series of *Ludi Saeculares* marked in *II XIII* 1.62–3 (with 20), and the emphasis on precedent in *ILS* 5050.111.) The hope is that the Roman people and its old values will continue (cf. Hor. *Saec.* 57–9). Perhaps connected with the games, at least in impact, is Augustus' adoption of his grandsons in 17 (cf. P. 4.6.82): the novelty of an implicitly monarchical line will carry on Augustus' revival of what is truly Roman.⁴

Particularly expressive are the lists of Roman triumphs and, in smaller letters, consuls which were probably placed in 19 BC on a triple arch in the Forum

⁴ On political developments see e.g. D. Kienast, *Augustus* (Darmstadt 1982) 92–101; P. Southern, *Augustus* (London 1998) 128–34; W. Eck, *The age of Augustus* (Oxford 2003) 58–65. An interesting use of the proconsular title by Augustus is now seen in an edict of 15 February 15 BC: see G. Alföldy, *ZPE* 131 (2000) 179–81 (line 2), 192–6. For Augustus and Romulus see J. von Ungern-Sternberg in W. Schuller (ed.), *Politische Theorie und Praxis im Altertum* (Darmstadt 1998) 166–82. For the *Ludi*, see P. Zanker, *The power of images in the age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor 1988) 167–72; D. Feeney, *Literature and religion at Rome* (Cambridge 1998) 28–38. On the adoption of Gaius and Lucius, cf. Fr. Hurlet, *Les collègues du prince sous Auguste et Tibère* (Rome 1997) 113–14, 427–9.

celebrating Augustus' Parthian success (20 BC). These graphically exhibit the continuous sequence to which Augustus belongs – even though triumphs are to become the monopoly of the *princeps*' family. The later Forum Augustum will contain many statues of Republican great men, often in triumphal clothing (*II* xiii 3.1–41). The much-celebrated Parthian success itself (P. 4.6.79–80) shows Augustus rectifying the acts of earlier politicians-cum-generals through the return of in particular the standards lost to the Parthians by Crassus in 53 BC. He spends much of his time, despite the difficulties, in the traditional sphere of great Romans: military and organizational activity in the provinces. His return in 19 BC (cf. P. 4.3.70–2) is celebrated in a new altar to Fortune and new *feriae*, the Augustalia (other honours are declined). The Parthians' surrender of the standards, though not actually the fruit of military victory, is made to sustain Augustus' own coherent career from the forties on, as is brought out by the temple of Mars Ultor decreed in 20 BC (Dio 54.8.3, cf. *RIC* 1² Aug. 28, 39, 68–74, 103–6, 507, all c. 19 or c. 19–18 BC). One side-question for the reader of book 4 is how far this consistent career, growing in greatness (4.6.24, 37–44), is like or unlike that of the book's poet-narrator.⁵

The idea of the continuous line of great Romans appears in P. 4.11, from a female and familial perspective; 4.10 and 4.11 bridge the historical gap between Romulus and the present. But for most of its course book 4 dwells on radical oppositions; these are driven home by various explicit passages, including the opening and 4.4.9–14. But form is especially significant. Varro's *De vita populi Romani*, though a primary source for such oppositions of time in Augustan literature, in its own structure portrayed the gradual development of Rome. So did Livy's vast embodiment of Roman history, still being written. P. draws on Livy and his sources; but the portion of Livy from which he draws for his narratives is both minute and unified – since the story of Cacus (P. 4.9) in Livy appears inset within his account of Romulus (1.7.3–15 within 1.4–16). Tibullus 2.5 and *Aeneid* 8 are other important embodiments of the contrasts. Yet Propertius 4 does not reflect the diachronic depiction of Roman history at the end of *Aeneid* 8 which draws the different times of that book together, and joins Augustus to outstanding men of the late Republic, Cicero and Cato (667–70). From that depiction of history one event, Actium, appears in isolation (4.6). Tibullus 2.5 is a single poem, integrated into its collection at beginning and end (lines 1–18, 83–122, cf. 2.1, 2.2, 2.3.11–28). Propertius 4, in its drastic confrontations of different times

⁵ For careers poetic and political cf. J. Farrell in P. Cheney and F. A. de Armas (edd.), *European literary careers* (Toronto 2002) 24–46. For the position of the 'Capitoline' *Fasti* and the date of the arch see esp. E. Nedergard, *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici* 27 (2001) 107–27; for the *Fasti triumphales* (to which additions on the monument after 19 were probably not envisaged) cf. T. Itgenshorst, *Hermes* 132 (2004) 436–58. On Augustus' Parthian honours see J. W. Rich, *PBSR* 53 (1998) 71–128; cf. also for evocation of the past through the position of the arch R. T. Scott, *JRA* 13 (2000) 184–5.

through successive poems (2–5, 8–9), has a uniquely potent form for expressing these oppositions.⁶

Augustus, when he appears in 4.6, displays continuity with his ancestors, and is essential to the continuity of Rome (37–46). He is, in conjoining phrase, the *Longa mundi seruator ab Alba*: Rome's scope is now the whole world (cf. 19, 39). In 4.11.60 he appears as *deo*: an innovation shared with Julius Caesar (4.6.59–60), but also a link with Hercules and Romulus (4.6.21, 9.13?, 32, 10.11). Even apart from the move towards continuity in its last two poems, the book's discontinuous approach to Roman history is not personally enough directed to appear antagonistic towards Augustus. (Ovid's disjunction of the denigrated Romulus from the great Augustus (F. 2.133–44) admits an antagonistic reading.) The book maintains a decorous surface of praise for the ruler. It thus invites questions from the reader on the poet's own continuity. He has proceeded from the depiction in book 1 of his family's suffering at the hands of Octavian (not yet Augustus) to the formal adoption in books 2 and 3 of a laudatory stance towards the *princeps*. The change coincides with the patronage of Maecenas; it is accompanied by some outspoken comments and barbed references in book 2, and by some sly combinations of poems in book 3.⁷

Equally, the approach of the book would not particularly fit the idea of imperial pressure, in a supposed 'second Augustan period' from c. 19 to c. 8 bc. Suetonius alleges that Horace was compelled by Augustus to write his fourth book of *Odes* (Vit. Hor. 39–43 Rostagni). He may simply be drawing an inference from *Odes* 4.4 and 14 (praising Tiberius and Drusus' recent victories); on these poems in turn he may or may not have evidence. But the thesis of 'compulsion' is at least made more plausible than in the case of Propertius book 4 by the relation of those *Odes* to things done lately by Augustus' close family; this fits in with the concerns of Aug. *Epist.* fr. 39 Malcovati (Augustus' regrets about, probably, *Epistles* book 1). Augustus' recent achievements receive only brief coverage in P. 4.6.77–84. 'Compulsion' is also made more plausible for *Odes* 4 than Propertius 4 by the particular interest of Augustus in Horace: Augustus commissioned him to write the *Carmen Saeculare*, obliged him to write *Epistles* 2.1, wanted him to become his secretary for correspondence, and addressed to him affectionate and uneasy letters (Suet. Vit. Hor. 18–61, Aug. *Epist.* fr. 37–41 Malcovati). Positive pressure on P. to write book 4 does not follow from the low profile of Maecenas both

⁶ Call. fr. 100–1 Pfeiffer (successive poems on earlier and later statues of Hera) may provide a precedent. On the structure of Varro's *De vita* cf. the edn. of B. Riposati (Milan 1939) 257–61; for the order of fragments within books see the edn. of M. Salvatore (Hildesheim 2004) 5–23. The whole of Livy offers important material for the reader of book 4, as the commentary seeks to show. Cf. A. J. Woodman, *CQ* 48 (1998) 568–9.

⁷ Cf. 1.21–2; 2.1.25–42, 7, 10, 15.41–8, 16.19–20, 37–42, 31, 34.61–2; 3.4 and 5, 9.53–6, 11.29–12.6, 18.11–12, 33–4 (Julius). ('Book 2' may well be the MSS' conflation of two books.) The issue is more profitably considered in terms of the reader's response to the text than of the author's sincerity and insincerity. On Romulus in the *Fasti*, cf. A. Barchiesi, *The poet and the prince* (Berkeley 1997) 154–64, 166–77.

there and in *Odes* 4 (indirect allusion P. 4.8.1; *Odes* 4.11.13–20 devoted but isolated reference). The disharmony between Maecenas and Augustus spoken of by Dio and others (Dio 54.19.3, 6 (16 BC), 55.7.5, Tac. *Ann.* 3.30.2–4; Suet. *Aug.* 66.3) would account for this tact in regard to the patron with whom both poets were associated. It is not even clear that P. is driven by tact, when book 4 so reduces the role of the narrator-poet, and when books 2 and 3 address only one poem each to Maecenas (2.1; 3.9). If the manuscripts' book 2 was originally two books, book 2*b* addresses no poem to him.⁸

The two poems in book 4 with relatively direct relations to the régime, 6 and 11, have counterparts in book 3, probably published soon after 23 BC (3.11 on Actium; 3.18 on Marcellus, closer to the *princeps* than Cornelia). In this area, a gradual development of P.'s work from books 2 to 4 appears more plausible. More broadly, a poetic fashion for exploring the remote Roman past seems likelier than imperial insistence on that unpersonalized theme. Tibullus' great poem on the past, 2.5, praises his patron Messalla rather than Augustus. It draws inspiration from the *Aeneid*, which was already being written by 25 BC. The detail and plan at least of Virgil's poem seem to be his own initiative: Augustus did not know its outline (Don. *Vit. Verg.* 31, Aug. *Epist.* fr. 36 Malcovati). At all events, P.'s treatment of the past follows literary predecessors and his own design rather than the outlook of Augustus.⁹

One aspect internal to literature is of particular significance: the deaths of Virgil in 19 BC and of Tibullus in c. 19. Death places these figures themselves in the past. The *Aeneid*, whose process of birth was celebrated in 2.34.61–6, now exists; but its author is a dead classic. Propertius 4 reworks much Virgilian material: so the first poem mentions Aeneas in the second line and 4.6 and 4.9 connect throughout with Virgil. The book avoids the *Aeneid*'s monumental (if intricate) continuity of narrative; but through its own discontinuity it creates a still wider image of Rome. The *Aeneid* is diverged from, played with and constantly present. One book of the *Aeneid* (8) is concentrated on especially; such concentration eschews the appearance of reworking or miniaturizing the whole epic. 4.6, as was indicated, removes from Actium the context of Virgilian continuity. 4.9 affects as it were to make Virgilian continuity denser by inserting a fresh story between act and altar (*Aen.* 8.185–275); it thus in fact light-heartedly disrupts Virgil's narrative connection and its own cohesion of mood. Virgil's metamorphoses as a writer

⁸ On the 'second period' cf. C. O. Brink, ed. of Horace, *Epistles* 2 (Cambridge 1982) 523–72, R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Horace: behind the public poetry* (Oxford 1995) 136–8, 189–92. Sceptical on Maecenas' loss of favour: G. Williams in K. A. Raafaub and M. Toher, *Between republic and empire* (Berkeley 1990) 258–75 (not mentioning Dio 54.19); P. White, *CP* 86 (1991) 130–8. Both Horace and P. lived near Maecenas on the Esquiline; Hor. *Sat.* 1.9.48–52, Aug. *Epist.* fr. 33 Malcovati (and 37?), suggest the closeness of their coexistence.

⁹ The importance of discontinuity in the *Fasti* (e.g. 3.101–4) likewise illustrates a determinedly Ovidian perspective, and is not simply the inevitable result of aetiology. Marcellus, the hoped-for heir, appears in Virg. *Aen.* 6.860–86 too, and was buried with his mother Octavia in Augustus' mausoleum as *gener Augusti Caesaris* (*CIL* VI 40356).

of hexameter, dwelt on in P. 2.34.59–84, stand in the background of P.'s own evolution as displayed in book 4.¹⁰

The death of Tibullus, who is never mentioned in P. but with whom he is often in dialogue, leaves P. as a kind of continuator (like one historian continuing another). The last part of Tibullus' last and probably unfinished poem is taken up in P. 4.5 and to some degree 4.7 (Tib. 2.6.29–42 (dead sister), 43–54 (*lena*)). The first poem, and the whole book, take up from Tibullus' penultimate poem. This is somewhat like continuous things having the same extremity (Arist. *Phys.* 5.227a10–13), as in continuous parts of a geometrical line. One may contrast the interpolation within Virgil's narrative in 4.9. The continuity also marks a significant caesura: elegy continues without and beyond Tibullus. In 4.7 itself, the death of Cynthia is a more prominent and intimate expression of the apparent end of P.'s love-elegy, but not of elegy or the elegist.¹¹

Horace's career is less of a presence (there seem no strong grounds to equate him with *Horos*). Even in *Odes* books 1, 2 and 3 a biological dynamic is much more prominent in the depiction of the narrator. In *Odes* 4 (13 BC?), which may very well be later than Propertius 4, the age and achievement of the narrator are much more conspicuous for the reader than they are here. The *Odes* are played with specifically as the book investigates the possibility of love-poetry without Cynthia (4.8). Horace's *Satires* may have made a general contribution to the poetry of the particular in Propertius 4, especially in conjuring up Rome (see section 3 below on vocabulary). The effect of the youngish Ovid is unknowable; the likelihood that P. 4.5 precedes *Amores* 1.8 suggests the same for P. 4.3 and the *Heroides* (see introductions to those poems). A background will also have been created by numerous other poets now lost.¹²

3. PROPERTIAN AND ELEGIAC CONTEXT

A fundamental area of continuity or discontinuity for the reader of book 4 is the poet's own past, and particularly the preceding books. P. was born c. 58–54 BC,

¹⁰ Cf. introduction to 4.2. However, to view book 4 as above all a response to the *Aeneid* (cf. C. Becker, *Hermes* 99 (1971) 477–80) takes too Virgilian an angle. The placing of two poems based on *Iliad* and *Odyssey* between 4.6 and 4.9 would suggest at any rate an engagement with the epic tradition as a whole. See also n. 29 below.

¹¹ P.'s *libri* change with her death (4.7.49–50, 77–86), but visibly continue. Ovid, *Amores* 3.9 within the present book 3 sets the death of Tibullus against the continued life and enterprise of Ovid. For the intertextual relations of P. and Tibullus, see R. O. A. M. Lyne, *CQ* 48 (1998) 519–44. P. E. Knox's early dating of Tibullus 1 would alter the picture (*CQ* 55 (2005) 204–16), though the priority of Propertius 1 is not in any case certain. On the ending of Tibullus 2.6, see M. D. Reeve, *Phoenix* 38 (1984) 235–9.

¹² Cf. e.g. 3.1.12–14, 4.1.136, Hor. *Epist.* 1.19.1–22, Ov. *Ex P.* 4.16. Horace and Horos: cf. e.g. R. Lucot, *Pallas* 17 (1970) 113. Ov. *Tr.* 4.10.40–56 suggest influence primarily from P. on Ovid, though of course Ovid is being decorous.

book 4 indicates (1.131–2n.), in or near Assisi (cf. 1.[125–6]n.); his family suffered from confiscations. After his first book, like Virgil after the *Eclogues* and Horace before his first publication, P. was taken up by Maecenas. Book 1 was not published before L. Volcacius' governorship of Asia, which probably began earlier than 27 BC; book 2, or at least 24, appeared not later than 25, book 3 not long after 23. After this intensive activity (cf. 2.3.1–4) followed a substantial pause. Book 4 is also preceded by what looks like emphatic closure to the series of P.'s books: at the close of book 3 the affair with Cynthia which was the basis of the series is said to be at an end (3.24–5, cf. 3.17, 20, 21, 23). This is an unexpected development after the elaborate build-up in the book's prologue poems of love-elegy as P.'s genre (3.1–3, cf. 3.5.19–24, 9.43–6). The contemporary reader was left to wonder what would come next: (a) nothing; or (b) a resumption of love-elegy (in literature lovers' break-ups need never be final); or (c) a resumption of poetry but an abandonment of love-elegy and the principles of 3.1–3. In fact, after years of (a), both (b) and (c) are realized.¹³

The question for the reader of book 3 is made the more interesting, and (c) seems the more possible, because the body of that book has strained its links with love-elegy, while formally maintaining them. Many poems in book 3 connect with the narrator-poet's love at beginning or end but diverge into other subjects, including a mythological narrative (3.15); that type of escape is paralleled near the end of book 1 (1.20). Few poems deal directly with the narrator's love throughout. 3.5.19–48 have actually contemplated the possibility of change after the affair: but a change to studying philosophy, with no mention of writing it, let alone in elegiacs.¹⁴

3.1–3 have presented the most elaborate account of the genre, a topic which P. handles with growing fullness. As in 1.9 and 2.34, the tradition of elegy is connected with love. In 1.9.11–12 Mimnermus, who wrote among other things of love, is made the Greek representative of the genre. In 2.34.29–32, the imitation

¹³ On dates for books 1–3 see Lyne (n. 11 above) 520–4. On governors of Asia in the twenties, see B. E. Thomasson, *Laterculi praesidium* 1 (Gothenburg 1984) 205–6; C. Eilers, *Tyche* 14 (1999) 77–86. L. Vinicius (*cos. suff.* 33) is probably governor in 27, Sex. Appuleius in 26. If the 'house of Propertius' in Assisi was P.'s (inscriptions *SEG* 30.1135–44), he kept a house there after his move to Rome; but the style of the paintings and the prosody of the epigrams pose difficulties with this conjectural ascription (cf. M. J. Strazzulla, *Assisi romana* (Assisi 1985) 77–81).

¹⁴ Contrast 2.10.7–8, 19–20, 25–6: war-poetry to come. Cf. Don. *Vit. Verg.* 35 (philosophy after *Aeneid*), possibly with a basis in letters, like Macr. *Sat.* 1.24.10–11; Hor. *Epist.* 1.1.1–12 (philosophy after poetry, but said in poetry); P. 2.34.27–8 (the tragic poet also studying and perhaps writing philosophy). The term 'narrator', used of the poet-speaker in most of the commentary, is not meant to exclude his formal identification with the author (see below), which is essential to the play and formal self-irony in the book. The term has the advantage of keeping it in view that, whatever his relation to the actual author's experiences, he is in the text necessarily a literary construct. Cf. for recent discussion D. Clay, *MD* 40 (1998) 9–40, R. G. Mayer, *MD* 50 (2003) 55–80.

of Callimachus and Philetas, who were commonly ranked first and second as elegists, is conjoined with writing love-poetry. The list of Latin love-poets at the end of the poem (85–94) reinforces the elegiac connection. Callimachus and Philetas frame the group 3.1–3. The imitation of Callimachus' elegiac prologue (*Aet.* fr. 1–4 Massimilla) is here much more extensive; but P.'s sort of poetry is linked with love by Apollo and the Muse (3.3.19–20, 47–50), and with Cynthia by the poet (3.2, cf. 3.1.11 *Amores*). Grounds for connecting Callimachus himself with love were developed by Ovid (*Rem.* 381–2, cf. 759–60); his love-epigram is prominently quoted by Horace (*Sat.* 1.2.105–8).¹⁵

A divorce between love and elegy appears, as was seen, a possible consequence of book 3. But there are particular problems. First, the image of elegy built up in books 1 to 3 involves a close association between the poet and his notional life. The conception is probably not new to P.: so in *Eclogue* 10 the love-elegist's supposed life is bound up with his poetry, and escape in genre and place is a paradox. How is a change from love within the elegiac genre to be expressed in terms of the narrator's life? Second, in P. books 1 to 3 there seems to be a strong generic specification: this is first-person poetry, set in the present day (and typically in Rome); it deals with the narrator-poet's own supposed love. It will, by extension, be emotionally and pragmatically useful to other lovers. In P. the specification is to appear all-pervasive: the softness and seductiveness of elegy applies at every level from style onwards. How, then, is a separation of love and elegy possible? What has been published seems to determine the future much more strongly than, say, for Virgil, who keeps to hexameter but ranges from love to war. Particularly relevant to book 4 is the inclusion in elegy's self-definition of an opposition with epic, which has been presented as a genre concerned with war and with Roman history and politics. Very early Roman history and Actium have been prominent among the subjects contrasted with the elegist's love-poetry.¹⁶

¹⁵ A love-epigram by Callimachus (42 Pfeiffer) has been written on the walls of Maecenas' 'auditorium' on the Esquiline. Cf. also M. Puelma, *MH* 39 (1982) 221–46, 285–304; A. Barchiesi, *Speaking volumes* (London 2001) 123–7. Callimachus, though generally influential on Latin poetry, is seen as above all an elegist. It is interesting that except at Stat. *Silv.* 5.3.157 – and even there cf. Mart. 10.4.11–12 – he is actually *named* by poets only in elegy, or with reference to elegy (or epigram). For his pre-eminence in elegy, borne out by papyri of the *Aetia*, cf. e.g. Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.99–101 (adding Mimnermus), Ov. *Rem.* 381–2, Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.58 (Philetas' second place less universally agreed than Callimachus' first). Of the poets in 2.34.85–94 Gallus was an elegist, Calvus wrote on Quintilia in elegiacs (fr. 15–16 Courtney), Catullus wrote on Lesbia in elegiacs and other metres, Varro of Atax' metre on Leucadia is unknown (cf. Ov. *Tr.* 2.439–40); *uersu* . . . *Properti* in line 93 is significant. On the structure of book 3 see M. R. Comber, *JRS* 88 (1998) 37–55. Butrica (n. 3 above) offers an interesting linear reading of books 2 to 4.

¹⁶ Cf. 2.1.23, 3.3.3, 3.9.49–51 (very close in subject to 4.1.1–10); 2.1.30–4, 3.9.55–6. Shortly after 3.9.3.11.29–72 suggest complications. On elegy seducing the reader cf. e.g. T. Fear, *Arethusa* 33 (2000) 217–40.

The emancipation in book 4 rests partly on an event within the poet's notional life, the death of Cynthia; but more fundamental is a larger movement into the past, to create a redefinition of elegy. Elegy does not have an evolutionary history of continuous progress, like that of Rome, or indeed Latin literature (cf. 4.1.61 on Ennius). Rather, the single work of the single supreme exemplar forms the basis for a more profound restoration of the past. P. is in a way to Callimachus as Augustus is to Romulus (his re-creation of Romulus is supported at 4.6.37–44); P., however, is crossing nationalities. Nor is he returning to the founder, disputed for elegy. He does, however, also make something of a return to the early stages of the genre: it supposedly originated, apparently not before its literary inventor, in lament or eulogy of the dead, and then in inscriptions (Hor. *AP* 75–8). Inscriptions feature extensively in the book, and two poems are themselves inscriptions (2 and 11); the last poem, going back further still, recalls lamentation for the dead.¹⁷

The actual literary history of Greek elegy is hard for us to write. The tendency of new discoveries is to expand our notion of its possibilities. Poetry on mythical and contemporary war, including narrative, is now seen in archaic and classical elegy; love-poetry probably formed a part of Hellenistic elegy. The tight definition of the genre seen in Propertius books 1 to 3 and in some works of Ovid is likely to be a Roman invention. But after the accumulation of P.'s own and other Roman love-elegy, this return is to seem a bold and discontinuous leap.¹⁸

Formal discontinuity, recent finds suggest, is a significant concern of Hellenistic books of elegy and epigram. The sections of Posidippus' book cultivate discontinuity and so variety; Parthenius' (?) poem on metamorphosis (P. Oxy. 4711) proceeds by separated sections rather than a flowing narrative. Continuity and discontinuity on many levels form a major concern of Callimachus' *Actia*. That work traces practices which (theoretically) have lasted into the present. The poet presents himself as having continued his approach to poetry throughout his life (fr. 1 Massimilla). This self-presentation is perhaps connected with the gap in time between the first and last pairs of books. However, the approach which the self-presentation defends involves discontinuity (fr. 1.3 Massimilla): the defence particularly concerns the disjointed sections (or 'poems') of books 3 and 4, which by that very form are discontinuous with books 1 and 2. In most of books 1 and 2,

¹⁷ See section 4 below. 4.11 adds a further complication by drawing especially on Roman inscriptions; but this translates, without obliterating, the suggestion of generic history. For poets *inventing* elegy cf. e.g. Hermesianax fr. 7.35–6 Powell, Didymus fr. pp. 387–8 Schmidt (with etymology; what is Didymus is uncertain). Etymology also e.g. Diomed. *GLK* 1 484–5; D. L. Page in *Greek poetry and life* (Oxford 1936) 206–10; M. L. West, *Studies in Greek elegy and iambus* (Berlin 1974) 2–9; N–H on Hor. *C.* 1.33.2.

¹⁸ Narratives of war: P. Oxy. 4708 (Archilochus); Simon. fr. 1–18 West; cf. also Mimn. fr. 13, 13a, 14, 17 West, and in war Callinus and Tyrtaeus. On Hellenistic love-elegy, see P. J. Parsons, *MH* 45 (1988) 65–74; A. M. Morelli, *RFIC* 122 (1994) 385–421; J. L. Butrica, *PLLS* 9 (1996) 297–322; G. O. Hutchinson, *JP* 138 (2002) 7–8.

the Muses answered the narrator's questions, within a continuous narrative. Those books provided an orderly set-up, with a relatively definite specification: the sections we know of predominantly explain surprising aspects of ritual in particular cities, and also of religious objects (statues of Artemis and Athena, fr. 35–8, 110 Massimilla). In books 3 and 4, diverse sections (poems) succeed each other with no liaison, not even a connecting particle (contrast fr. 9.19, 35, 50.84 Massimilla). Only a minority follow the 'classic' pattern of the religious πρόβλημα (tricky question followed by answer) as seen in the previous books. Some have no explanation of present religious practice or objects at all (e.g. fr. 64, 67–75, 96, 102, 106–7 Pfeiffer); some deal with the *ending* of a past ritual (fr. 91–3, 98–9 Pfeiffer; cf. already, perhaps, fr. 51 Massimilla in book 2). There are, however, numerous thematic interconnections between these sections and across the whole poem; these touch P.'s thematic network only incidentally.¹⁹

In going back to the *Aetia*, P. performs a striking unification of place. Callimachus' poem had ranged all over the Greek world; even Rome had appeared (fr. 106–7 Pfeiffer), but to show the great breadth of the poem. P.'s poems are concentrated on Rome, and to that degree continue and thematize the world of books 1–3. It must be remembered, though, that P. is drawing on a probably large body of Greek poetry that used the *Aetia*; some of this will have dwelt on single cities. Cf. *SGO* 01/12/02 (2nd cent. BC, on Halicarnassus), which includes a god speaking in reply to the inquirer. The *Aetia* covers a wide range of time, with some extreme confrontations, and some diachronic history (esp. fr. 75.51–74 Pfeiffer); in P. until 4.10 the aetiological poems are all drawn into the opposition of two periods.²⁰

The name of Callimachus' poem is 'causes', a force for continuity across time. The seed from which it grows is the πρόβλημα on cult, in particular on the

¹⁹ The *Diegeses* (M. van Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers' Digests?* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 175, Leiden 1998) 74–81, 259–65, 273–8) give us a good knowledge of the contents for books 3 and 4; for recent information on book 3, see C. Gallazzi and L. Lehnus, *ZPE* 137 (2001) 7–18. *Phalaeus* (ibid. 7–13), and *SH* 254–69, fr. 63, 76–7a, 86, 90, 100–1, 104 Pfeiffer, fr. 64 Massimilla, seem likeliest to fit the standard specifications. On the *Aetia* in general see G. O. Hutchinson, *ZPE* 145 (2003) 47–59, with literature. Series of προβλήματα had provided the form of lost works by Aristotle and others; Callimachus may very well have been preceded by prose 'Greek questions', including religion and 'why?', as in Plutarch's Αἰτια Ἑλληνικά and P. Oxy. 2688–9 (all 'why?', like most of the Pseudo-Aristotelian *Problems*). For Posidippus (ed. min. C. Austin and G. Bastianini (Milan 2002)) see B. Acosta-Hughes, M. Baumbach and E. Kosmetatou (edd.), *Labored in papyrus leaves* (Washington, D.C. 2004), K. Gutzwiller (ed.), *The new Posidippus* (Oxford 2005); on P. Oxy. 4711 see G. O. Hutchinson, *ZPE* 155 (2006) 71–84. Ovid's *Fasti* combines division with an approximately continuous sequence of time.

²⁰ For Callimachus and Propertius book 4, see esp. Pillinger (1969); J. F. Miller, *ANRW* II 30.1 371–96. On Callimachus and *SGO* 01/12/02 cf. G. B. D'Alessio in S. Isager and P. Pedersen (edd.), *The Salmakis inscription and Hellenistic Halicarnassus* (Odense 2004) 43–4. Butas' Roman aetiological poem will precede P.'s book 4 if Butas is Cato's freedman: cf. *SH* 234–6.

reason for strange features of ritual. Causation and ritual are not strongly linked in Propertius 4 (not explicitly stressed in 4.9; applied to a god's title in 4.10.1, 45–8; in 4.8 not applied to the ritual (3–14) but displaced to recent behaviour (1–2, 16)). Aetiological concern with ritual is limited in the book, though religious and ritual behaviour runs through the poems, sometimes with distortion or parody (burial distorted 4.4; purification parodied 4.8). The great focus of aetiology in the book is different, and derives from an important but less overtly stressed element in Callimachus. This is the monument or object, which embodies continuity in its most total form: a past thing remains. So poem 2 accounts for the form of a statue (and is an inscription itself), 3 at the end accounts for a future dedication (and quotes writing), 4 accounts for a grave which exists no longer, 5 for a grave which does not yet exist, 6 for a temple, 7 near its end for a future inscription about death (83–6), 9 for a ritual feature but also for two monuments, 10 for a temple and a title, 11 for a grave (and it is an inscription itself). This emphasis on objects takes the poems back to inscribed epigram, which much of the *Aetia* transforms. The emphasis on writing confuses the objects and the poems now being read, especially in 2 and 11; continuity encompasses even the reader's present experience.²¹

Callimachus affects continuity and discontinuity in Propertius 4 very variously. The gods, a basic Callimachean inheritance of book 4, form a great temporal continuity, which spreads from a distant past into the time of writing (6.69–70, 9.71–2, cf. 2.57–8). They contrast with death, in some ways the supreme mode of discontinuity in the book. Narrative, the biggest Callimachean legacy, creates continuity within each poem. Callimachus may lie partly behind the use of telling physical detail in the book, which makes the differences of time more tangible (see below). Callimachus' consistent career, so prominently handled in the prologue to the *Aetia*, is used in 4.1 to present a continuity which the narrator will fail fully to maintain, the continuity of his love and love-poetry. What disrupts the continuity of his love-poetry is precisely his ambition to become Callimachus through aetiological poetry. The very break between the parts of Callimachus' 'prologue' (fr. 1–2, 3–4 Massimilla) – really two prologues, as a result of changes in the *Aetia* – gives rise to the structure in which P.'s first poem dramatizes opposed ideas of elegy.²²

²¹ It is rewarding to compare the role of objects in book 4 with K. Atkinson's novel, *Behind the scenes at the museum* (London 1995): there a narrative present alternates with the family's past, told in separate, disjointed sections of narrative ('footnotes'), with links made principally through surviving objects. The aetiological idea could be seen as implicit elsewhere in book 4 (why does Cynthia behave as she does (4.5), why have there been no poems directly about Cynthia (4.7)?). On epigrammatic elements in the *Aetia*, see P. J. Parsons in *Callimaque* (Entr. Hardt 48, Geneva 2002) 129–30, 139; D. Meyer, *Inszeniertes Lesevergnügen* (*Hermes Einzelschr.* 93, Stuttgart 2005) 225–43.

²² A tripartite structure (fr. 1, 2, 3–4) would still have the vital break in form. A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his critics* (Princeton 1995), holds that fr. 1 too belongs to the first edition. P. book 4 intriguingly brings in Callimachus' epic (but small) hymns; it

The Callimachean narrator's thirst for knowledge, self-parodically handled, drives books 1 and 2 of the *Aetia*. The narrator has a less marked degree of personification in books 3 and 4, though he makes extremely lively appearances (cf. esp. fr. 75.4–9, 44–9 Pfeiffer). The Muses are in theory the chief speakers in books 1 and 2; books 3 and 4 make considerable use of other speakers, which include the object itself or its owner speaking for a whole poem (Simonides fr. 64 Pfeiffer, wall fr. 97, Berenice's lock fr. 110 – like P. 4.11 the last section, save the epilogue). Propertius book 4 lacks the vivaciously characterized scholar-narrator of Callimachus. In books 1–3 the unified first-person speaker had been basic to the genre, and a fundamental continuity. Now the narrator is fractured into two voices and characters, both formally identified with the poet. P. is named twice: in 4.1.71, after announcing his aetiological plans, and in 4.7.49, as the poet who had celebrated Cynthia. 4.1, 4.7, 4.8 sketch a life-story, including a life-story of love. In 4.5, 4.7, 4.8 the narrator is more or less the enamoured figure of previous books, though other speakers give us different perspectives on him. In 4.4, 4.6, 4.10 he is a stern and patriotic narrator (in 4.9 he is more detached). Tarpeia's love gets no sympathy from him. The division of the formally single narrator strongly expresses the discontinuities of the book.²³

Still more radical discontinuity is created by the complete absence of the narrator-poet's voice from three of the poems, in prominent positions: 4.2, 4.3, 4.11, spoken by Vertumnus, Arethusa, Cornelia. Large parts of further poems are given over to other speakers: 4.1 Horos, 4.4 Tarpeia, 4.5 Acanthis, 4.7 Cynthia (cf. also Apollo and Hercules in 4.6 and 4.9). Apart from Horos in the introductory poem, these speakers are all women or gods: they are in a completely separate category from the narrator, and so impossible to half-identify with him. (Horos too is entirely different from him.) The basis of the genre as formed by its specification in books 1–3 could hardly be more forcefully broken up. But not, it will be seen, into mere diversity and unconnected fragmentation.²⁴

conspicuously uses the single elegiac hymn in one of the most straightforwardly aetiological poems (9.57–8) and uses a hexameter hymn in a poem where Callimachus is presented as elegist (6.35–6, cf. 6.4). It thus pointedly illustrates the actual range and generic complexity of his *œuvre*.

²³ Some elements of the severe patriotism appear in earlier poems, as in 3.11.29–50, where it is in conflict with the narrator's outlook earlier in the same poem (cf. 47–9 with 1–8). The name of P. in books 2 and 3 is often connected with his love-poetry: 2.34.93, 3.3.17, 10.15 (cf. 1.1.1). The names of Catullus and Tibullus, when used in their poems, are much less linked with their poetry, at any rate on the surface.

²⁴ Speeches by imaginary characters have a part in rhetorical education, to which P. would have been exposed if he began training for an advocate's career (cf. 4.1.136); in general such exercises had become much more popular during his lifetime. Of interest for 4.3 are speeches to wives by husbands leaving for war (Theon p. 70 Patillon; situation made mythological in Hermog. *Prog.* 9 p. 20 Rabe). But this type of exercise in particular was thought closely related to poetry, and influence will have been mutual and complex. Cf. Sen. Rh. *Con.* 2.2.12 (Ovid); Quint. *Inst.* 3.8.49, Theon pp. 2–3 Patillon. Utterances of

Some aspects of the language and metre will add detailed points to the discussion. First, vocabulary. Book 4 brings us into a world, or rather worlds, full of physical objects. The use of these in itself marks a notable change from earlier books, but one that presents numerically a relatively steady development. A list of non-proper nouns which occur in only one book of P. and are not abstract or verbal produces: 7 for book 1, 50 for book 2 (a book considerably longer than the others and maybe originally 2 books), 98 for book 3, 147 for book 4. Thus the poetry is already in book 3 exploiting a much wider range of physical entities. But in book 4 these unique nouns mostly acquire a thematic role from the book, and make vivid cultural change, or sometimes cultural continuity: they illuminate the basic opposition of times. The list from book 4 repays reading, for all its bristling bulk. It includes, as will be noticed, words unfamiliar in dignified literature (e.g. *brassica*); a considerable number indicate occupation or rank; clothes; practical instruments and household objects. Words which in their context help to mark out different stages in civilization, or connections between them, are underlined.²⁵

*aceruus, aduena, agnus, altrix, amphora, ansa, asellus, balteus, barba, beryllus, brassica, bulla, cadus, caelator, caelebs, caespes, caprificus, carbasa, carpentum, casses, caterua, cathedra, catula, cerasus, clatra, codex, colus, corbis, cornix, costum, creta, crotalistris, crystallus, cucumis, cucurbita, cutis, ductor, elegus, equa, exta, faenus, fascia, ferculum, fibra, filum, formula, fossa, frux, funda, fur, gaesum, glacies, gula, gutta, guttur, hippomanes, hyacinthus, ianitor, incola, inguen, insitor, institor, iuba, iuncus, lamina, lectica, lena, limes, littera, litura, lorica, lugubria, lupus, mannus, messor, moecha, moles, nanus, nardus, nidus, noctua, nutrix, palla, pallium, pascuum, patera, pelagus, pergula, pertica, petasus, pirus, pluteus, popa, porcus, portitor, prelum, princeps, proauus, profugus, prunum, pulpitum, purpura, pyropus, quasillum, racemus, ripa, riuus, rosarium, saeta, sagina, salua, sarcina, sator, sceptrum, sella, senatus, series, seruator [almost verbal], simulacrum, sirpiculus, spica, spina, sputum, stipēs, suboles, sudis, sulphur, supellex, taberna, tegula, temo, tignum, toga, torquis, truncus, uncus, uterus, uallus, uerbenā, uerna, uictima, uigil, uindex, uinea, uipera, uitrum, zona.*²⁶

all speakers in the book, including the narrator, should be approached with the alertness of readers skilled in deconstructing rhetoric.

²⁵ Nouns are normally excluded if they have a cognate adjective etc. in another book; a few uncertainties of classification and text remain. For discussion of many individual nouns in Propertius, see H. Tränkle, *Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache* (Hermes Einzelschr. 15, Wiesbaden 1960) 110–27.

²⁶ The words from book 3 may be added for comparison: *aluus, ancora, antistes, arbiliter, arista, axis, baris, bruma, cacumen, caestus, camera, cassida, cerua, claustrum, clauis, coluber, conopium, contus, coruus, crater, crux, cumulus, cynus, cymbalum, cymbium, daps, ephemeris, epistula, famulus, fauces, formica, fretum, fuscina, genitor, gymnasium, gyrus, habena, haruspex, hiems, imber, interpres, isthmus, lacuna, lana, lintheum, lorum, lotus, lynx, magistra, manica, memorator, meretrix, metallum, naris, neruus, nuntius, oliuum, oppidum, paeon, paelex, palaestra, pancratium, pecunia, plaustrum, pomarium, pons, portentum, praeconium, prouincia, pugnus, pumex, pyramis, rabies, rana, regio, sacrarium, saga, salebra, scamnum, scrinium, sistrum, spelunca, statua, stimulus, stirps, summa, supercilium, thyrsus,*

The elegiac couplet is a particularly suitable medium for the book. In the Augustan (and triumviral) period, it is an essentially self-contained unit, formally discontinuous with what precedes and follows it. It draws attention to its own elaborate polish and perfection. P.'s particular density of writing heightens the identity of each couplet as a small work of art. Artistry and control are thus felt to underlie the larger discontinuities of the book. The couplet contrasts with the more varied movement of hexameter poetry, especially in epic and Virgilian matter (poems 6, 9, 10; 9.16–18 play on the patterns of pastoral). The elegiac couplet contains an inbuilt potential for contrast or divergence between hexameter, shared with epic, and pentameter: this internal break is sometimes put at the service of bigger discontinuity. The first couplet of the book illustrates this, and the finesse of Propertian metre:

Hoc quodcumque uides, hospes, qua maxima Roma est
ante Phrygem Aenean collis et herba fuit.

The disjunction between hexameter and pentameter clearly expresses the discontinuity of time; the proper words *Roma* and *Phrygem* are placed close together in surprising succession. But the second half of the pentameter is here made a notably distinct entity too. The two simple nouns, equated (*fuit*) with the whole scene of Rome, have in this position a curt and reductive effect. To this effect Hor. *C.* 4.7.14–16, with a hexameter and as it were a half-pentameter, offers a metrically more extreme analogy:

nos, ubi decidimus
quo pius Aeneas, quo Tullus diues et Ancus,
pulis et umbra sumus.²⁷

The impression of control is enhanced by one significant respect in which the metre of this book occupies a summit of refinement. This is the reduction of pentameters ending with anything but a disyllable to 1.3%, as against 2.6% in book 3, 10.7% in book 2, 35.4% in book 1 (Tibullus has 6.7% in book 1, 8.4% in book 2). The change over books is once again steady. But the remarkable feature is that no non-disyllabic endings occur after 4.5: the book itself increases in refinement as it proceeds. Polysyllabic endings are evenly spread between the parts of books 1–3. The rigour of the author's art is felt still more as the book

tormentum, trabs, triens, trochus, tympanum, uenenum, uer, ueru, uiola, uirga. The list has less of an earthy and satire-like element than the list for book 4; but above all it does not have the same thematic point.

²⁷ In P. 4.1.2 *Phrygem* is marked out by its brevity, and by the singular, perhaps less dignified than *Phryges* or *Phrygius*; in Virgil only *Aen.* 12.99 *semiuiui Phrygis*. Continuity or discontinuity in versification and larger structuring go together in the opposition between Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*. Callimachus is not so concerned with contained elegiac couplets as the Augustans: cf. e.g. fr. 89 Massimilla.

progresses. And the point prepares us to see that the book has a crucial onward movement.²⁸

4 THE SHAPE OF BOOK 4

The connection of the poems within the book is clear, despite the discontinuity. The discontinuity itself issues in pointed oppositions rather than random variety; there are numerous continuities; and sequence is vital. The design of book 4 must be seen as dynamic; it moves purposefully as it develops. Thus the theme of tombs and death involves particularly Tarpeia, Acanthis, Cynthia, Cornelia: it is apparent that this order could not be changed without altering meaning and shape. But it is within the genre and the poet's *œuvre* that the design has its fullest significance.²⁹

The first poem, in setting up an opposition between two conceptions of elegy, is clearly preparing and thematizing the presence of two different sorts of poem – which in practice overlap. It is also making their coexistence puzzling and unpredictable. In the course of poems 2–8, those poems which relate to love can be seen as coming gradually closer to P.'s earlier presentation of the genre, and to Apollo's stipulations (cf. 4.1.133–46). 3 and 4 both depict love, but a woman's love. Arethusa's letter and Tarpeia's speech (4.31–66) both look like love-poems; one is still further separated from the narrator-poet of the book by marriage, one by time. 5 introduces the narrator as lover; but his love is seen from a non-amorous angle, by the money-minded procuress. Whether Cynthia is the mistress is left deliberately unstated. 7 finally introduces Cynthia unequivocally; she talks of the narrator's love or lack of it, but she and the poem allow him little opportunity to

²⁸ Especially in books 2 to 4, many of the polysyllables are Greek names or Greek loan-words; those in books 3 and 4 which are not: *pumicibus* 3.3.28, *nequitiae* 19.10 (cf. 1.15.38, 2.5.2); *aucupio* 4.2.34, *tunicis* 2.38 (cf. 2.29b.26), *deliciis* 4.76 (cf. 2.34.74), *Pudicitiae* (proper name) 5.28 (cf. 1.2.24, 15.22, 16.2). Greek loan-words, generally much rarer in Tibullus, do not occur among his polysyllabic endings; cf. R. Maltby in J. N. Adams and R. Mayer (edd.), *Aspects of the language of Latin poetry* (PBA 93, London 1999) 379–82. Proper names, Greek and other, play a part (Tib. 1.3.32, 58, 4.62, 5.36, 7.10, 16, 10.66). The enclitic *est*, which like *-que* makes one word with the word it follows, does not affect a disyllabic ending.

²⁹ On the importance of sequential reading cf. M. Riffaterre, *Essais de stylistique structurale* (Paris 1971) 327–8; it may be added that later readings follow the tracks of a first reading (in its various stages), while deepening it. The dead Cynthia and Cornelia could be seen as forming part of a shadowed female *Odyssey* in the book: 3 would present a Penelope waiting (cf. 3.12.23–38, 4.5.7–8), 7 a first *nekuia* (cf. *Od.* 11), in which a ghost appears and speaks, 8 the return of a female Odysseus (cf. *Od.* 22), 11 a second *nekuia* (cf. *Od.* [24]), set in the underworld, and redounding to the credit of the virtuous woman. Cf. Sch. *Od.* 24.1 for the difference between the two '*nekuiai*'; J. F. Berthet in *L'épique romaine* (Paris 1980) 151–2 notes the special importance of *Od.* 11 to P. For more material on individual poems in what follows, see the commentary.

speak. Her death makes the poem a retrospect on the love-poetry, which it seeks to close, rather than a straightforward example of that poetry. 8 finally gives us a poem with the living Cynthia, put largely in the narrator's voice. Its mode, however, is narrative and comic. Just as 4.2 can be seen to indicate, metapoetically and misleadingly, the variety of the book, so 4.8 can be seen to explore, through the partying in Cynthia's absence (27-48), the idea of love-poetry without Cynthia. It does not work. On the other hand, Cynthia's death has been no obstacle to the appearance of this new Cynthia poem, set at an earlier time. It is less clear than ever where the book will go.

It is also unclear what the reader should want. Should the reader be hoping for the resumption of business as usual, or should Cynthia be seen as a repressive force, restricting the narrator-poet's expansive ambitions? The notion of conflict between males and females has certainly emerged in 4.8 with full vigour. In 4.3 Arethusa merely sought to manipulate the soldier through words, to unknown effect; but in poems 4 and 6 the males have physically destroyed the females. In 5 Acanthis perished, but without the powerless narrator's action. In 4, the woman has been seen hopelessly dreaming of persuasion (55-62); in 5 techniques of trickery appear efficacious; in 6 the woman has actually usurped male arms (22). In 6, however, the woman's perspective was not shown to the reader; Cleopatra occupied a minor place in a poem dominated by male general and male god (himself like a general). In 6 as in 4 the woman was regarded with scorn by the male narrator (6.22, 65-6); in 5 the woman was hated by the narrator, but had also been feared. 7 was again a conflict of words, which the woman seemed to win, if only on style and force. 8 gives the woman physical and soldierly power; the males are physically defeated. The general is Cynthia.

In poem 9, Hercules seeks to prevail on women by words, like a love-poet rather than a hero. His *paraclausithyron* makes him briefly effeminate rather than amorous (esp. 47-50). But then, as in 4, a moment of male violence settles everything (for the man); his ensuing revenge through ritual is a revenge on the entire sex. Conflict between men dominates poem 10 entirely; females and the feminine are totally excluded. This marks a metaliterary defeat for the women in the battle of the sexes; and the book has at this point separated itself completely from the love-poem. 11 offers a kind of union of the male and female, but integrated in the idea of the Roman family, not simply a love-affair between two people. The poem shows no elegiac softness or sensuousness. The voice of the narrator-poet is completely absent, and the poem is further from his earlier ethos than 4.3. While the book has to some degree reconciled some of its oppositions, it has moved decisively away from the conception of elegy in the earlier books. The poet is now free. But, as one would expect in this book, the decisive division is infringed. Cornelia's unstated love takes the love of Cynthia and the narrator to a deeper level, emotionally and aesthetically. Yet not stating love is the very contrary of the love-poem.

The development of the 'Callimachean' poems is also rewarding to trace. The poems seem to get caught up in the environment provided by the surrounding poems, and so in continuities of a kind. Poem 2, following the prologue, serves the function of introducing the collection. In explaining the unusual nature of the statue it comes close to some sections of the *Aetia*. Narrative, however, is largely replaced by an abundance of transformations which suits the poem's metapoetic and introductory role. The lack of narrative makes the poem relatively untypical of the *Aetia* (cf. fr. 66 Pfeiffer *Fontes Argivi*, 79 *Diana Lucina*). Poem 4 has the narrative form. Stories of love appear in the *Aetia*, especially in book 3 (frs. 67–75 Pfeiffer *Acontius* (with a monologue, cf. Aristaen. 1.10.15–23, 49–84 Vieillefond), 80–1 *Phrygius*; fr. 110 *Lock of Berenice*); but this story of female passion seems to go beyond the decorum of the *Aetia*. Love-elegy, and the interests of the adjoining poems, lead to a contamination of Callimachean elegy.³⁰

Poem 6 begins a sequence particularly based on epic, from 6 to 9; these poems rework, respectively, *Aeneid* 8, *Iliad* 23, *Odyssey* 22, *Aeneid* 8. 4.6 separates itself from love-elegy: after elaborately parading its elegiac credentials, it establishes its 'anti-elegiac' and epic credentials too (cf. 31–6). It also forms part of a sequence set in the present age, from 5 to 8. This links the poem to the specification for elegy in earlier books, and makes it unusual in Callimachean terms. Fr. 110 Pfeiffer *Lock of Berenice*, the last section of the *Aetia*, comes particularly close here (cf. the frame of aetiology in *SH* 254–69 *Victoria Berenices*, fr. 89 *Massimilla Icus*). The lightness of fr. 110 brings out the pomp of 4.6, and its concern with literal war, which is marginal to the feminine world of the *Lock*. The aetiology of 6 never seems fully articulated. 6 is further affected by its centrality: like 7, it has various aspects of the 'proem in the middle'.³¹

After all these twistings of the Callimachean conception, poem 9 comes much closer to Callimachus: at its heart is a 'classic' aetiological πρόβλημα, and it plays with the god in Callimachean vein (cf. esp. *Aet.* frs. 24–7 *Massimilla*). As in the preceding 8, the poem's epic inheritance leads into parody and comedy. 10 in some ways goes still further towards Callimachus: the *causae* which join it to the *Aetia* are emphatically marked at beginning and end (1, 45). The miniaturism of the poem gestures towards quasi-Callimachean theories on brevity. But the deeds of kings and heroes, the martial subject-matter, the unhumorous tone separate it as much from Callimachus as from love-elegy. It is almost a hyper-Callimachean

³⁰ It is not known whether there was any internalizing treatment of the unchastity in fr. 94–5 Pfeiffer *Leimonis*.

³¹ Cf. G. B. Conte, *YCS* 29 (1992) 147–59. Especially relevant to 4.6.1–14 is the allegory of Virg. *G.* 3.1–48 (growing out of the equine matter in that book). Numerical rather than approximate centrality is less important when poems are not numbered in the text. In any case, the first poem renders the boundaries of the book proper ambiguous, so that without the prologue 4.7 would correspond to *Eclogue* 6.

poem: it shows the 'Callimachean' conception of elegy at its furthest distance from the rival conception.

Poem 11 declines to be seen in terms of either love-elegy or 'Callimachean' elegy, though it has affinities with both. It is mostly not narrative, unlike 4 and the series from 6 to 10. It connects with epitaphs, including Callimachean poems on dead women (*Ep.* 15, 16, 20, 50 Pfeiffer), and with *epicedia*: poems of lament, often on women. Elegy goes back to its supposed roots in mourning, or praise, for the dead – save that the dead person herself is speaking. In poems 9 and 10 the book had moved towards poetry particularly like the *Aetia*, and poetry going beyond it. After all the book's untidy conflict between types of elegy, the 'Callimachean' type had eventually emerged victorious and, in 10, untainted. But book 4 ends with a poem that owes relatively little to either type, and shows its poet's supreme creativity and range.³²

Other aspects of the book tie in with some of these features. The treatment of place provides a continuity, as has been seen, and a theatre for discontinuity, as Rome's changes are surveyed. The one poem not set principally at Rome, 6, shows strongly by its setting the importance of present Rome for the whole world; this is the political climax of the work. The use of the place Actium (described 4.6.15–18) links in with the role of other places in the poems. Italian cities appear as, in early days, the sources of gods, enemies and luxury (poems 2 and 4); but cities in Latium can appear as now mere extensions of Roman life – though with their own ancient cults (Tibur in 7, Lanuvium in 8). Foreign countries, often remote, appear as modern sources of luxuries, enemies and victories (4.3.7–10, 33–6, 63–8, 5.21–6, 57, 6.77–84). Poems 10 and 11 depict Rome's expansion in power; and so bridge the gap of time.

Within the emphasis on Rome goes an opposition in place on a smaller scale: an opposition between inside and outside, indoors and outdoors, house and city. This ties in with the opposition of the sexes, and the morality of the women. Poems 1 and 2 are both set outside, 2 on the edge of the Forum. 3 largely evokes a world within the house (in which it is to be imagined as written by Arethusa); Arethusa ventures out only for religious reasons (57–8, cf. 71–2). The husband's far-flung imperial campaigns are contrasted; social structures make Arethusa's wishes to be with him counter-factual (43–8). In 4 Tarpeia's related wishes (31–6) are put into practice by bold movement outside to meet the enemy (81); her

³² The setting in the world of the dead takes the last poem in the series on to a different plane, as in the last of Rilke's ten *Duineser Elegien*. The section of sepulchral poems Posid. 42–61 A–B is concerned only with women save for 60–1, and implies a conception of female epitaphs as an entity. Elegiacs were used for Calvus' and at least some of Parthenius' *epicedia* (fr. 1–5 Lightfoot *Arete* (three books), 6 *Archelais*, 27?; fr. 17 *Auxithemis* metre unknown). Fr. 6 plays with the metrical demand: a shift to another metre is needed to include (and in various ways preserve) Archelais' name.

excursions have turned from religion to love (15–28). Her monologue is set at least within the citadel; but she will betray it. Poem 5 conjures up, and should be imagined as set in, the indoor world of the woman exploiting her enclosure to allure lovers.³³

The military action of poem 6 is set outside even Rome, and beyond even the land. 7 is set inside, where the lover sleeps; households are vivaciously depicted (35–48, 71–6). 8 too is largely set within the space of the lover's house (including a garden); but the uninhibited and virile Cynthia drives herself off on adventures. In 9 the male, stuck outside, seeks to enter an enclosed female space. The military action of 10 occurs not only outdoors but largely outside cities; Tolumnius must leave the city to fight (31–6). 11 is spoken in the strange locale of the underworld, within the doors of the grave but as if in an outside place, at the rivers of the dead (15–16; see the introduction to the poem). The poem refers to foreign conquests (30, 38–40), and a Roman funeral (55–60); but its greatest concern is with the house, and its last part concentrates on the family's inside world (61–96). Domestic space is intimately used (79–84). The poem does not ultimately aspire to an 'epic' and martial magnificence; tragedy, a more domestic genre, feeds its dignity and depth. So the handling of space relates to the conflicts and the gradations of the book, and adds to its total cohesiveness.

The principal women and the principal gods of the book form opposed series. They contrast in gender, and in power and knowledge. The stress on female death underlines the women's defining mortality. Cynthia in 8 and the adjacent Hercules plainly connect as violent heroes; but poem 7 has marked Cynthia's power in advance as obviously transient, unlike that of the future god Hercules. Poem 5 also stresses transience within the life of women (cf. esp. 59–62). Vertumnus' subsistence throughout Roman history is made plain; Tarpeia does not last beyond the war with the Sabines in which Vertumnus arrived (2.49–54). Poems 2 and 9, however, play on notions of deity. Vertumnus is really a powerless statue, or more than one statue (2.59–63); Hercules exhibits behaviour which makes the continuity into godhead paradoxical. Apollo's divine splendour is scarcely tarnished, though it supports a wide range of poetry (cf. 1.133–46, 6.31–6, 69–86); the allegorical aspects of 1 and 6, and the reference to his appearances in poems (6.31–6), perhaps suggest his being created by poetry as well as creating it. The central poem displays, aptly, the grandest god; poem 10 in a way goes further still with Jupiter, but he is in a small temple and hardly present. The boundaries between mortal males and gods are often crossed, by Hercules, Romulus, Caesar, Augustus; but at the end Cornelia too almost joins

³³ Ancient readers would automatically suppose the speech of 5, like the writing of 3, to be set inside; cf. also Hdas. 1.1–12 and Ov. *Am.* 1.8.22. So too, presumably, Tarpeia's monologue, though the nature of buildings for early Vestals on the Capitol would not be clear. For enclosed places in book 4 cf. DeBrohun (2003) ch. 3, on the *linen*.

the series (11.101-2). The last poem, in any case, goes to the women rather than the gods.³⁴

In the internal series of the women, the moral differentiations are evident. The modern but respectable Arethusa contrasts with the shameless if loving Tarpeia of old, who contrasts with the cynically exploitative modern *lena*. 5, 7 and 8 could be seen as offering contrasting images of Cynthia; she in turn contrasts with the (morally) supreme woman Cornelia.

Conceptions of women's, and men's and gods', morality turn on the idea of continuity, especially on the willingness to abide by earlier agreements, *foedera*. This is a notion that elsewhere forms a crucial part of the Romans' self-characterization. Arethusa reproaches the man for doubtful adherence to their marital *foedera* (3.11-12, 69-70). Tarpeia undergoes a great alteration in behaviour and nature, thanks to love. Her new wickedness makes it actually legitimate, from the viewpoint of male narrator and king, to break a *foedus* with her (4.81-2, 87-92). Acanthis recommends ignoring oaths (5.27-8); consistent inconsistency is the way to prevail in love. Apollo maintains his *fides* to Rome (6.57) and also to Augustus, himself a pattern of consistency (24, 39, 77-84). Cynthia claims her own loyalty to her *foedus* with the narrator (7.51-4), which the narrator has purportedly forgotten (13-14, 21-2). His poetic inconsistency is related (has he abandoned love-elegy?). In poem 8 his lack of constancy, which allegedly retaliated for a lack of constancy (27-8), is severely punished. After that, a *foedus* again seeks to determine future conduct, doubtfully (71-82). The Roman and masculine connotations of the institution are here apparent.³⁵

Romulus offers another image of continuous success and virtue (10.17-18), like Augustus; with their consistency Hercules and Vertumnus contrast. Cornelia sustains old Roman values, and emphasizes that she has not changed: *nec mea mutata est aetas . . . mi natura dedit leges a sanguine ductas* (11.45-8). Change and moral failure are associated. It is Cornelia's continuity with her ancestors that entitles her to join them in the skies (43-44, 101-2).

But should Cornelia's final position give her values the last word? The discontinuous collocation of poems, and the use of a speaker other than the narrator, mean that finality does not impose closure as it could with a single line of narrative or argument in a story or a treatise. The absolute meaning, or even the view of the author, is left opaque. The book pursues not so much persuasion in the reader as the stimulation of ideas. It ends in enigma.

³⁴ There is little sense in the book that the significance of fundamental discontinuities for humans is abolished by a divine perspective on them; cf. J.-F. Lyotard, *La confession d'Augustin* (Paris 1998) 25-9.

³⁵ Cf. e.g. Livy 34.31.3-4 . . . *cum uos intueor, Romanos esse uideo, qui rerum diuinarum foedera, humanarum fidem socialem sanctissimam habeatis*. J. P. Sullivan, *ICS* 9 (1984) 30-4 emphasizes the theme of *fides* in the book; cf. G. Freyburger in *L'élegie romaine* (Paris 1980) 105-16 for *foedera* in love and their background.

5. TEXT

The text of book 4 is highly corrupt; even when it is sound, the basic meaning is often obscure. In consequence, any commentary must make textual discussion and verbal elucidation an essential element. A fuller apparatus is required than is usual in this series; unlikely manuscript variants are normally omitted.³⁶

The oldest MS is N (12th or early 13th cent.), missing for 4.11.17–76. The next MS to concern us is Π, not extant, but made for or by Petrarch (1304–74). This was copied from A (c. 1230–50), which is missing for book 4; it was copied by F (c. 1380) and by the source of L (1421) and P (1423). Π is sometimes right against N, though the visual difference is seldom large (cf. esp. 4.2.19 *uoces* Π: *noces* N; 37 *sub petaso* Alton: *suppetat* hoc Π: *supperat* hoc N; 8.39 *crotalistria* Turnebus: *c(h)oralistria* Π: *eboralistria* N; 9.38 *recepta* Π: *suscepta* N; 10.45 *haec* P, *nec* FL: *nunc* N; 11.94 *uacet* . . . *uia* Π: *ualet* . . . *uias* N). N often appears right against Π; the difference is sometimes substantial (so 4.1.28 *nuda* N: *facta* Π; 2.2 *paterna* N: *petenda* Π; 7.20 *pallia* N: *pectora* Π; 8.11 *corripit* N: *colligit* Π).³⁷

In the places just mentioned (4.1.28, 2.2 etc.), the probable truth in N is shared by another group of MSS, which descend from the lost Λ (T c. 1427, J c. 1430–45, K 1469, W 15th cent., M 1465, U c. 1465–70, R 1466, S c. 1470, C 1470–1). Λ did not present N's blank at the end of 4.3.7, but offered a probably spurious supplement which appears also in Π; in general both Π and Λ abhor sizable vacuums. All or some of the Λ MSS have most of the correct readings of Π mentioned above. Λ when copies were made of it probably combined readings from different sources, including a Π manuscript. It is not altogether easily determined whether one of these sources was derived from N, and so whether Λ in effect lacks independent authority, except in 4.11.17–76. For present purposes it will be most helpful to include its evidence; details on individual Λ MSS are often omitted ('N+' or 'Π+' denotes N or Π and some of the Λ MSS, 'Λ p.o.' almost all the Λ MSS). Probably or possibly correct readings of Λ MSS in isolation from NΠ could be due to conjecture (4.1.146, 2.5, 5.50, 6.25 (conjecture likely with *Nereus*), 8.22, 69). The *recentiores* (indicated by ⚭) present many valuable conjectural corrections.³⁸

³⁶ Much fuller accounts of the manuscript tradition in Butrica (1984) and in S. J. Heyworth, *The elegies of Sextus Propertius* (diss. Cambridge 1986). The latter in particular informs what follows; but a more agnostic line is taken here on the third branch of the tradition (Λ).

³⁷ N, F, L and P were collated in making the present edition, from original, facsimile or microfilm; but the apparatus is much indebted to Dr Heyworth's.

³⁸ *plaustra* Bootes at 3.5.35 (*flamma boon* N, *flamma palustra* Π; *plaustra* (or *palustra*) *bootes* (or *bootes*) TSCΓP^{as}, *plaustra boones* YT^m?) after *cur serus uersare boues et* should not be regarded as a difficult conjecture to make, nor as necessarily correct (cf. Rothstein's *it* (better *sit*?) *flamma Bootae*). Cf. e.g. Ov. *Met.* 10.447 *flexerat* . . . *plaustrum* . . . *Bootes*, Germ. *Arat.* 139 *tardus in occasu sequitur sua plaustra Bootes*, Luc. 2.722 *plaustra Bootae*, Mart. Cap. 2.98.3 *succendit plaustra Bootes*, Isid. *Etym.* 3.71.8 *eundem et Booten dixerunt, eo quod plaustro haeret Bootes*, Petrarch *Epist. Metr.* 6.33–4 *inuictus plaustra reliquit* . . . *Bootes*. Important for the questions about Λ are Poggio, *Lettere*, ed. H. Harth, 1 (Florence 1984) nos. 73.50–8, 74.17–18, which indicate that Poggio sent a MS of Propertius to Niccolò Niccoli in 1427.

Scholarship in the last forty years has made a huge contribution to the textual criticism of P. Work for this edition has suggested that in book 4 transposition does not provide the best solution to any difficulty, and that, as is beginning to be recognized, some interpolation of lines has occurred. Where the solution is unclear, obelization usually seems the most candid policy; it also keeps the less textually minded reader aware how precarious the text of P. is.

SIGLA

N	Guelferbytanus Gudianus 224 (olim Neapolitanus)	saec. xii uel xiii ineuntis
F	Florentinus Laur. plut. 36–49	c. 1380
L	Oxoniensis Bod. Holk. misc. 36	1421
P	Parisinus B.N. lat. 7989	1423
T	Vaticanus Vat. lat. 3273	c. 1427
J	Parmensis Palatinus Parm. 140	c. 1430–45
K	Vratislaviensis Akc. 1948 KN 197	1469
W	Vaticanus Capponianus 196	saec. xv
M	Parisinus B.N. lat. 8233	1465
U	Vaticanus Vrbinas lat. 641	c. 1465–70
R	Genauensis Bodmerianus 141	1466
S	Monacensis Vniu. Cim. 22	c. 1470
C	Romanus Casanatensis 15	1470–1
	Ω consensus horum codicum	
Π	FLP	
Λ	TJKWMURSC	
	Λ <i>p.o.</i> codices huius classis paene omnes	
N+	N cum aliquot codicibus classis Λ	
Γ	JKW	
Υ	MUR	
ς	aliquis uel aliqui recentiorum	
ⁱ	manus prima	
ac	ante correctionem	
pc	post correctionem	
c	post correctionem, si prior lectio legi non potest	
ras	in rasura	
il	in linea	
al	supra lineam	
mg	in margine	
ul	uaria lectio	
t	textus	

SEX. PROPERTI LIBER QVARTVS

I

Hoc quodcumque uides, hospes, qua maxima Roma est
ante Phrygem Aenean collis et herba fuit;
atque ubi Nauali stant sacra Palatia Phoebō,
Euandri profugae procubuere boues.
fictilibus creuere deis haec aurea templa, 5
nec fuit opprobrio facta sine arte casa.
Tarpeiusque pater nuda de rupe tonabat,
et Tiberis nostris aduena †bubus erat†.
qua gradibus domus ista Remi se sustulit olim,
unus erat fratrum maxima regna focus. 10
curia, praetexto quae nunc nitet alta senatu,
pellitos habuit, rustica corda, patres.
bucina cogeat priscos ad uerba Quirites;
centum illi in prati saepe senatus erat.
nec sinuosa cauo pendebant uela theatro; 15
pulpita sollemnes non oluere crocos.
nulli cura fuit externos quaerere diuos
cum tremere patrio pendula turba sacro,
annua at accenso celebrare Parilia faeno,
qualia nunc curto lustra nouantur equo. 20
Vesta coronatis pauper gaudebat asellis;
ducebant macrae uilia sacra boues.
parua saginati lustrabant compita porci,
pastor et ad calamos exta litabat ouis.
uerbera pellitus saetosa mouebat arator, 25
unde licens Fabius sacra lupercus habet.
nec rudis infestis miles radiabat in armis:
miscebant usta proelia nuda sude.

1 qua 5: quam Ω 4 procubuere 5: con- Ω 6 nec M: non Π 8 bubus M:
tutus Π: murus Heyworth 9 qua 5: quo ΠA: quod N: quot
Dielerich: nunc Heyworth 9-10 ista, Remi . . . sustulit olim: unus ita distinxit Watts; ante
olim plerumque interpungitur 11-14 praebet Lact. Inst. 2.6.14, 13 Isid. Etym. 18.4.1 13, 14,
11, 12 hoc ordine Lact., 5 11 nunc quae Lact. 13 uerba: arma Isid. 14 prati Hemsius:
-o Ω, Lact. prato nempe Shackleton Bailey ante 15 lac. statuit Heyworth 15 cauo
om. Π 19-20 del. Heyworth 19 annua at Lachmann: annuaque Ω (annuaque . . .)
celebrante Housman 21 Vesta P^hA p.o.: uestra MIT^α 23 pauca Lachmann 27
infestis: aeratis Hutchinson

prima galeritus posuit praetoria Lycmon,
 magnaue pars Tatio rerum erat inter oues. 30
 hinc Tities Ramnesque uiri Luceresque Soloni;
 quattuor hinc albos Romulus egit equos.
 quippe suburbanae parua minus urbe Bouillae,
 et, qui nunc nulli, maxima turba Gabi.
 et stetit Alba potens, albae suis omine nata, 35
 tunc ubi Fidenas longa erat isse uia.
 nil patrium nisi nomen habet Romanus alumnus;
 sanguinis altricem ¶non putet¶ esse lupam.
 huc melius profugos misisti, Troia, Penates;
 heu quali uecta est Dardana puppis aue! 40
 iam bene spondebant tunc omina, quod nihil illos
 laeserat abiegni uenter apertus equi,
 cum pater in nati trepidus ceruice pependit,
 et uerita est umeros urere flamma pios.
 hinc animi uenere Deci Brutique secures, 45
 uexit et ipsa sui Caesaris arma Venus
 arma resurgentis portans uictricia Troiae:
 felix terra tuos cepit, Iule, deos,
 si modo Auernalis tremulae cortina Sibyllae
 dixit Auentino rura pianda Remo, 50
 aut si Pergameae sero rata carmina uatis
 longaeuum ad Priami uera fuere caput:
 'uertite equum, Danaï: male uincitis. Ilia tellus
 uiuet, et huic cineri Iuppiter arma dabit.'
 optima nutricum nostris, lupa Martia, rebus, 55
 qualia creuerunt moenia lacte tuo!
 moenia namque pio conor disponere uersu.
 ei mihi quod nostro est paruus in ore sonus!
 sed tamen exiguo quodcumque e pectore riui
 fluxerit, hoc patriae seruiet omne meae. 60
 Ennius hirsuta cingat sua dicta corona;
 mi folia ex hedera porrige, Bacche, tua,

29 Lucmo *Scaliger* 31-2 *adulterinus suspicatus est Hutchinson*; ante 31 *lac. statuit Baehrens*, post
 32 *Müller* 31 Soloni *N+*: col- *Π+* 33, 36, 35, 34 *hoc ordine Müller* 33 minus:
 procul *Heyworth* Bouillae ς : uiolae Ω 36 tunc *Ritschl*: hac Ω longa . . . uia ς :
 longe . . . uias Ω ire Π 38 quis putet *Hutchinson* putet *NFL* Λ *p.o.*: pudet *P*: putat
R post 38 55-6 *transtulit Lange* 40 huc *Palmer* 41 illos *Schrader*: illam Ω 45 hinc
Heinsius: tunc Ω 46 uenit et ipsa, . . . arma, Venus, *Hollis* 47-8 post 40 *transtulit*
Marr 52 lata f. *Heyworth* post 52 87-8 *transtulit Müller* ante 57 61-2 *transtulit*
Heyworth 57 conor ς : -er Ω 58 quam *Francius*

ut nostris tumefacta superbiat Vmbria libris,
 Vmbria Romani patria Callimachi!
 scandentes quisquis cernet de uallibus arces, 65
 ingenio muros aestimet ille meo.
 Roma, faue: tibi surgit opus. date candida, ciues,
 omina, et inceptis dextera cantet auis.
 sacra diesque canam et cognomina prisca locorum;
 has meus ad metas sudet oportet equus. 70
 ‘quo ruis, imprudens †uage† dicere fata, Properti?
 non sunt a dextro condita fila colo.
 accersis lacrimas cantans; auersus Apollo.
 poscis ab inuita uerba pigenda lyra.
 certa feram certis auctoribus, aut ego uates 75
 nescius aerata signa mouere pila.
 me creat Archytae suboles, Babylonius Horops,
 Horon, et a proauo ducta Conone domus.
 di mihi sunt testes non degenerasse propinquos,
 inque meis libris nil prius esse fide. 80
 †nunc pretium fecere deos et fallitur auro
 Iuppiter obliquae signa iterata rotae
 felicisque Iouis stellas Martisque rapacis
 et graue Saturni sidus in omne caput
 quid moueant Pisces animosaque signa Leonis 85
 lotus et Hesperia quid Capricornus aqua†
 [dicam ‘Troia, cades, et, Troica Roma, resurges’;
 et maris et terrae longa sepulcra canam.]
 dixi ego, cum geminos produceret Arria natos
 (illa dabat natis arma uetante deo), 90
 non posse ad patrios sua pila referre Penates.
 nempe meam firmant nunc duo busta fidem.
 quippe Lupercus, equi dum saucia protegit ora,
 heu sibi prolapso non bene cauit equo.

65 quasuis *FL*: siquis *P^{ms} TS*: asis *T^{mg}YC*: asis siquis Γ cernet *F*: -it *NLP* 69 deos-
 que *Wellesley* 71 nouum carmen incipit ζ uage: fuge *Liueius*: caue *Schippers*: tua
Sandbach: noua *Hutchinson* discere ζ 73 cantans; *Baehrens*: -as Ω : (lacrimas:); cantes,
Hutchinson auersus cantat *Sandbach* 77 Horops ζ : Orops Ω 81-6 loco suo esse
 motos credidit *Lütjohann* (83-4 post 75, 85-6 post 102 transtulit *Richmond*): adulterinos suspi-
 catus est *Hutchinson* 81 nunc *N*: in Π deis *Lütjohann* 81-2 fallimus auro |
 (Iuppiter!) *Housman* 82 lac. post Iuppiter statuerunt *Sandbach*, *Heyworth* 83 felicitas *Kidd*: -es
 Ω 85 moneant *L* Λ p.o. 87-8 del. *Passerat*: post 52, 68, 70 transtulerunt *Müller*, *Marcilius*,
Scaliger 88 longa sepulcra: regna superba *Housman*: candida regna *Murgia* cano
Murgia 94 bene . . . sibi *Heyworth*

Gallus at in castris, dum credita signa tuetur, 95
 concidit ante aquilae rostra cruenta suae.
 fatales pueri, duo funera matris auarae!
 uera, sed inuito, contigit ista fides.
 idem ego, cum Cinarae traheret Lucina dolores
 et facerent uteri pondera lenta moram, 100
 “Iunoni facito uotum impetrabile” dixi.
 illa parit; libris est data palma meis.
 haec neque harenosum Libyci Iouis explicat antrum,
 aut sibi commissos fibra locuta deos,
 aut si quis motas cornicis senserit alas, 105
 umbrae quae magicis mortua prodit aquis.
 aspicienda uia est caeli uerusque per astra
 trames et ab zonis quinque petenda fides.
 exemplum graue erit Calchas: namque Aulide soluit
 ille bene haerentes ad pia saxa rates; 110
 †idem† Agamemnoniae ferrum ceruice puellae
 tinxit, et Atrides uela cruenta dedit.
 nec rediere tamen Danaï; tu diruta fletum
 supprime et Euboicos respice, Troia, sinus.
 Nauplius ultores sub noctem porrigit ignes, 115
 et natat exuuiis Graecia pressa suis.
 uictor Oiliade, rape nunc et dilige uatem
 quam uetat auelli ueste Minerua sua!
 hactenus historiae; nunc ad tua deuehor astra.
 incipe tu lacrimis aequus adesse nouis. 120
 Vmbria te notis antiqua Penatibus edit
 – mentior? an patriae tangitur ora tuae,
 qua nebulosa cauo rorat Meuania campo
 et lacus aestiuis intepet Vmber aquis? –
 [scandentisque Asisi consurgit uertice murus, 125
 murus ab ingenio notior ille tuo]
 ossaque legisti non illa aetate legenda
 patris, et in tenues cogeris ipse lares.

101 Iunoni 5: -is Ω facito *Lachmann*: -e Ω: facitis *Montanari Caldini* 103 haec SΥ:
 hoc MT+ Libyci 5: Libyae Ω 106 umbrae quae *Turnebus*: -ne quae *fere NA*: -que
 ne Π 108 zonis: stellis *Scaliger* 111–12 adulterinos suspicatus est *Heyworth* 111 idem:
 nempe *Hall*: ille *Hutchinson* 112 Atridis *Wakker* (-ae *maluisset Hutchinson*) 117 delige
Shackleton Bailey: detrahe *Georg* 119 deuehor 5: -ar Ω 122 tuae? – *fere nunc solent*
scribere 124 non tepet *Housman* 125–6 *del. Richmond* 125 Asisi *Lachmann*: Asis Ω:
 arcis *Scaliger*

nam tua cum multi uersarent rura iuueni,
 abstulit excultas pertica tristes opes. 130
 mox ubi bulla rudi dimissa est aurea collo,
 matris et ante deos libera sumpta toga,
 tum tibi pauca suo de carmine dictat Apollo,
 et uetat insano uerba tonare foro.
 “at tu finge elegos, fallax opus – haec tua castra – 135
 scribat ut exemplo cetera turba tuo.
 militiam Veneris blandis patiere sub armis,
 et Veneris pueris utilis hostis eris.
 nam tibi uictrices quascumque labore pararis,
 eludet palmas una puella tuas. 140
 et bene cum fixum mento decusseris uncum,
 nil erit hoc: rostro te premet ansa suo.
 illius arbitrio noctem lucemque uidebis;
 gutta quoque ex oculis non nisi iussa cadet.
 nec mille excubiae nec te signata iuuabunt 145
 limina: persuasae fallere rima sat est.”
 nunc tua uel mediis puppis luctetur in undis,
 uel licet armatis hostis inermis eas,
 uel tremefacta cauos tellus diducat hiatus,
 octipedis Cancri terga sinistra time.’ 150

2

Quid mirare meas tot in uno corpore formas?
 accipe Vertumni signa paterna dei.
 Tuscus ego et Tuscis orior; nec paenitet inter
 proelia Volsinios deseruisse focos.
 haec me turba iuuat; nec templo laetor eburno: 5
 Romanum satis est posse uidere Forum.

129 multi: pauci Heyworth 133 tibi om. N tuo Heyworth 135-46 Apollini assignat Heimreich, 135 8 Lütjohann 135 at NLPA p.o.: et F pallax Heinsius 137
 Veneris: dominae Heyworth 138 sed Voss 139 pararis Murgia: -asti Ω 140
 eludet 5: eludit NFA: et ludit Π 141 cum fixum ST: confixum MT+ merito Π
 decusseris 5, Broekhuysen (de-): discusserit Ω 142 rostro 5: nostro Ω premet 5:
 -at NLPA: -it F ansa 5: ausa Ω: ipsa Heyworth suo ΠA: tuo N 143-4 post
 140 transtulit Housman 145 seruata Hutchinson 146 limina TSYC: lumina MT+
 rima 5: prima fere Ω 149 cauos . . . hiatus Heinsius: -o . . . -um Ω: -um . . .
 -um 5 150 caue LP
 1 qui 5 2 signa: regna Housman paterna NA: petenda Π latente deo Shackleton
 Bailey 3 et add. 5 4, 51-4, 49-50, 55-6 hoc ordine Housman 5 me PA: mea NFL

hac quondam Tiberinus iter faciebat, et aiunt
 remorum auditos per uada pulsa sonos.
 at postquam ille suis tantum concessit alumnis,
 Vertumnus uerso dicor ab amne deus. 10
 seu quia uertentis fructum praecerpimus anni
 Vertumno †rursus† credidit esse sacrum.
 prima mihi uariat liuentibus uua racemis,
 et coma lactenti spicea fruge tumet.
 hic dulces cerasos, hic autumnalia pruna 15
 cernis et aestiuo mora rubere die;
 insitor hic soluit pomosa uota corona,
 cum pirus inuito stipite mala tulit.
 mendax Fama, uaces; alius mihi nominis index:
 de se narranti tu modo crede deo. 20
 opportuna mea est cunctis natura figuris:
 in quamcumque uoles, uerte, decorus ero.
 indue me Cois, fiam non dura puella:
 meque uirum sumpta quis neget esse toga?
 da falcem et torto frontem mihi comprime faeno: 25
 iurabis nostra gramina secta manu.
 arma tuli quondam et, memini, laudabar in illis;
 corbis at imposito pondere messor eram.
 sobrius ad lites; at cum est imposta corona,
 clamabis capiti uina subisse meo. 30
 cinge caput mitra, speciem furabor Iacchi;
 furabor Phoebi, si modo plectra dabis.
 cassibus impositis uenor: sed harundine sumpta
 †fauor† plumoso sum deus aucupio.
 [est etiam aurigae species Vertumnus et eius 35
 traicit alterno qui leue pondus equo.]

9 tandem *Annius*: spatium *Heinsius*: stagnum *Housman*: terram *Hutchinson* 10 Vertumnus
Paley 11 praecerpimus *Fea*: praecep- *N*†: percep- *Π*† 12 Vertumno *Ayrmann*: -i *Ω*:
 Vertanni *Paley* rursus: uulgus *ς*: populus *Hutchinson* (populus e.g. in lacuna post 10 statuta
Barber) creditur *ς* fructus creditur esse sacer *Ayrmann* 13-18 post 44 transpo-
 suit *Heyworth* 19 fama scribunt *edd.* uaces *ς*: uoces *ΠW* (= uaces, cf. *RS* 24.103):
 nocens *N* *Λ* p.o. alius: falsa es *Lachmann* 28 c. at i. *Passerat*: c. i. *Π*†: c. in i. *N*†:
 c. et i. *ς*: i. c. *Postgate*: c. in imbelli *Heyworth* 29 est om. *Π* ad lites adsum (uado
maluisset Hutchinson); cum imposta corona est *Lee* 31 Iacchi *ς*: Achei *Ω* 34 fauor
N: fauor *F*: faunor *L*: fauon/ *P* (on/ in ras.): factus *Boldrer*: Faunus *ς*: fautor *Rosberg*
 nauus . . . dicor in au. *Heyworth* 35-6 del. *Fontein*: post 32 transposuit *Goold* 35 fert . . .
 speciem *Heinsius* etiam: mea et *Postgate* specimen *Butler* Vertumnus: cum uer-
 bere *Postgate* 36 pondus: corpus *Passerat*

sub petaso pisces calamo praedabor, et ibo
 mundus demissis institor in tunicis.
 pastor me ad baculum possum curuare uel idem
 sirpiculis medio puluere ferre rosam. 40
 nam quid ego adiciam, de quo mihi maxima fama est,
 hortorum in manibus dona probata meis?
 caeruleus cucumis tumidoque cucurbita uentre
 me notat, et iunco brassica uincta leui;
 nec flos ullus hiat pratis quin ille decenter 45
 impositus fronti langueat ante meae.
 at mihi quod formas unus uertebar in omnes
 nomen ab euentu patria lingua dedit.
 et tu, Roma, meis tribuisti praemia Tuscis,
 unde hodie Vicus nomina Tuscus habet, 50
 tempore quo sociis uenit Lycomedius armis,
 quoque Sabina feri contudit arma Tati.
 uidi ego labentes acies et tela caduca,
 atque hostes turpi terga dedisse fugae.
 sed facias, diuum Sator, ut Romana per aeuum 55
 transeat ante meos turba togata pedes.
 (sex superant uersus. te, qui ad uadimonia curris,
 non moror: haec spatiis ultima creta meis.)
 stipēs acernus eram, properanti falce dolatus,
 ante Numam grata pauper in urbe deus. 60
 at tibi, Mamuri, formae caelator aenae,
 tellus artifices ne terat Osca manus,
 qui me tot docilem potuisti fundere in usus.
 unum opus est, operi non datur unus honos.

3

Haec Arethusa suo mittit mandata Lycotae –
 cum totiens absis si potes esse meus.

37 sub petaso *anon.*, *Allon*: suppetat hoc Π: supperat hoc Ν: suppetat hic *Heinsius* 39
 pastor me *Ayrmann*: pastorem Ω 40 medio puluere . . . rosam: mollis pondera . . .
 rosae *Hutchinson* puluere ferre: uendere (uel cogere) uere *Heyworth* 46 pendeat *Hem-*
bold (fulgeat *maluisset Hutchinson*) 47–8 *adulterinos suspicatus est Hutchinson* 47, *lac.*,
 51–4, *lac.*, 48: sic *Heyworth* 47 et *Pocchus* 48 nomina Vertumni *Schrader* 49–
 56: *uide ad* 4 49 at ΠΤ: haec *Camps* 52 quoque *Morel*: atque Ω 57 suberunt
Heyworth 60 grata pauper: pauper paupere *Heyworth* 62 premat *Liuius* 63 tot
 docilem *Hertzberg*: tam docilis Ω
 1 haec *PT^{ms}*: om. *NFL* ∧ *p.o.*

si qua tamen tibi lecturo pars oblita derit,
 haec erit e lacrimis facta litura meis;
 aut si qua incerto fallit te littera tractu, 5
 signa meae dextrae iam morientis erunt.
 te modo uiderunt iteratos [Bactra per ortus] < >
 te modo munito Persicus hostis equo,
 hibernique Getae pictoque Britannia curru
 ustus et Eoa decolor Indus aqua. 10
 haecne marita fides †et parce auia noctes†,
 cum rudis urgenti brachia uicta dedi?
 quae mihi deductae fax omen praetulit, illa
 traxit ab euerso lumina nigra rogo,
 et Stygio sum sparsa lacu, nec recta capillis 15
 uitta data est; nupsi non comitante deo.
 omnibus, heu, portis mea pendent anxia uota;
 textitur haec castris quarta lacerna tuis.
 occidat immerita qui carpsit ab arbore uallum
 et struxit querulas rauca per ossa tubas, 20
 dignior obliquo funem qui torqueat Ocno
 aeternusque tuam pascit, aselle, famem.
 dic mihi, num teneros urit lorica lacertos?
 num grauis imbelles atterit hasta manus?
 haec noceant potius quam dentibus ulla puella 25
 det mihi plorandas per tua colla notas!
 diceris et macie uultum tenuasse; sed opto
 e desiderio sit color iste meo.
 at mihi cum noctes induxit uesper amaras,
 si qua relictæ iacent osculor arma tua. 30
 tum queror in toto non sidere pallia lecto,
 lucis et auctores non dare carmen aues.
 noctibus hibernis castrensia pensa laboro
 et Tyria in chlamydas uellera †secta† tuas.

7 iteratos *N*: iteratos B(l)actra per ortus ΠΛ (B. p. o. *del. Heimreich*): intentos Bactra per arcus (arcus iam *Housman*) *Morgan et Sandbach*: pharetratos B. per ortus *Watt* 8 munito 5: munitus Ω Persicus *Dousa filius*: hericus Ω: ferreus *Postgate*: Sericus 5 10 ustus: tusus *Housman*: lotus *anon.* 11 et parce auia noctes *N*: et pacatae mihi noctes *FL* Λ p.o.: et pactae iam mihi noctes *P*: et primae praemia noctis *Housman*: ubi pactae iam mihi noctes *Heinsius*: et pacta haec (*ita Bury*) foedera (*Pelling et Reeve*) nobis *Watt*: et pacta haec praemia nuptae *Goold* 17 mea pendent anxia *Guyet*: pendent mea noxia Ω 21 obliquo: hic pigro *Hutchinson* 34 chlamydas *Housman et Barber*: gladios Ω secta: lecta *Heinsius* tuas *Lee* (tuos *Passerat*): suos Ω: suo *Rosberg*

et disco qua parte fluat uincendus Araxes, 35
 quot sine aqua Parthus milia currat equus.
 conor et e tabula pictos ediscere mundos,
 qualis et haec docti sit positura dei:
 quae tellus sit lenta gelu, quae putris ab aestu,
 uentus in Italiam qui bene uela ferat. 40
 assidet una soror, curis et pallida nutrix
 peierat hiberni temporis esse moras.
 felix Hippolyte! nuda tulit arma papilla
 et textit galea barbara molle caput.
 Romanis utinam patuissent castra puellis! 45
 essem militiae sarcina fida tuae.
 nec me tardarent Scythiae iuga, cum Pater altas
 †affricus† in glaciem frigore nectit aquas.
 [omnis amor magnus, sed aperto in coniuge maior;
 hanc Venus ut uiuat uentilat ipsa facem.] 50
 nam mihi quo Poenis †te† purpura fulgeat ostris,
 crystallusque meas ornet aquosa manus?
 omnia surda tacent, rarisque assueta kalendis
 uix aperit clausos una puella lares.
 Craugidos et catulae uox est mihi grata querentis; 55
 illa tui partem uindicat una tori.
 flore sacella tego, uerbenis compita uelo,
 et crepat ad ueteres herba Sabina focos.
 siue in finitimo gemuit stans noctua tigno,
 seu uoluit tangi parca lucerna mero, 60
 illa dies hornis caedem denuntiat agnis,
 succinctique calent ad noua lucra popae.
 ne, precor, ascensis tanti sit gloria Bactris
 raptaue odorato carbasa lina duci,

37–8 *del. Heyworth* 37 conor *Broekhuysen*: cogor Ω tabulis *Hutchinson* 46 issem
Heinsius 48 affricus: acriter *Keil*: astrictam *Schippers* uertit *Morgan* 49–50 *del.*
olim Helmbold 49 aperto in: rapto *Hoeufft*: adempto *anon. ap. Hoeufft* post 50 *lac. statuit*
Baehrens 51–6 ante 41 transtulit *Heyworth, lac. ante 51 statuta* 51 nam: ei *Heyworth* te
 N: tibi ΠΛ: nunc *Housman*: hic *Hutchinson* 52 meas N: tuas ΠΛ 53 iacent *Heyworth*
 rarisque: Martisque *Markland* assueta: adducta *Heyworth*: insueta *Hutchinson* (desueta
iam Baehrens) 55–6 post 32 transtulit *Housman* 55 Craugidos *Bergk*: Graucidos *fere* Ω
 56 tui . . . tori ζ: tui . . . toro Ω: tuam . . . tori *Guyet*: tori . . . tuam *Heyworth* 60 doluit ζ
 parca: plena *Heyworth* 62 succincti ζ: -ae Ω 63 ascensi . . . Bactri *Hutchinson*

plumbea cum tortae sparguntur pondera fundae 65
 subdolos et uersis increpat arcus equis;
 sed tua sic domitis Parthae telluris alumnis
 pura triumphantes hasta sequatur equos:
 incorrupta mei conserua foedera lecti.
 hac ego te sola lege redisce uelim, 70
 armaque cum tulero portae uotiuā Capenae
 subscribam 'saluo grata puella uiro'.

4

Tarpeium scelus et Tarpeiae turpe sepulcrum
 fabor, et antiqui limina capta Iouis.
 lucus erat, felix hederoso conditus antro,
 multaque natiuis obstreperat arbor aquis:
 Siluani ramosa domus, quo dulcis ab aestu 5
 fistula poturas ire iubebat oues.
 hunc Tatiū †fontem† uallo praecingit acerno
 fidaque suggesta castra coronat humo.
 quid tum Roma fuit, tubicen uicina Curetis
 cum quateret lento murmure saxa Iouis? 10
 namque ubi nunc terris dicuntur iura subactis,
 stabant Romano pila Sabina foro.
 murus erant montes; ubi nunc est Curia saepta,
 bellicus ex alto fonte bibebat equus.
 hinc Tarpeia deae †fontem† libauit, et illi 15
 urgebat medium fictilis urna caput.
 [et satis una malae potuit mors esse puellae,
 quae uoluit flammās fallere, Vesta, tuas?]
 uidit harenosis Tatium proludere campis
 pictaque per flauas frena leuare iubas. 20
 obstipuit regis facie et regalibus armis,
 interque oblitās excidit urna manus.

66–8 *hunc ad modum nunc solent scribere*: equis! sed (tua . . . equos) 67 sed: sic
Heinsius 72 grata: salua *Burman*
 1 scelus *Kraffert*: nemus Ω 3–8 ante 15 *transtulit Shackleton Bailey*; multis uero modis uersuum
 3–14 *ordinem mutant* 7 fontem: propter uel contra *Camps*: montem *Heinsius* 11 namque
Heyworth et Hutchinson: atque Ω 12 foro 5: foco Ω 13–14 ante 12 *transtulit Schippers*
 14 ex alto *Fontein*: ex illo Ω: exili *Postgate* 15 fontem: laticem *Barber*: rorem *Heinsius*
libabat Hutchinson: -arat *Fontein* et *Fontein*: at Ω 17–18 *del. Carutti*: post 2 *transtulit*
Wellesley, post 86 *Housman*, post 92 *Broekhuysen* 17 et: nec *Postgate* 20 frena *Palmer*:
 arma Ω

saepe illa immeritae causata est omina Lunae,
 et sibi tingendas dixit in amne comas;
 saepe tulit blandis argentea lilia Nymphis, 25
 Romula ne faciem laederet hasta Tati.
 cumque subit primo Capitolia nubila fumo,
 rettulit hirsutis brachchia secta rubis.
 et sua †Tarpeia† residens ita fleuit ab arce
 uulnera uicino non patienda Ioui: 30
 ‘ignes castrorum et Tatiae praetoria turmae
 et formosa oculis arma Sabina meis,
 o utinam ad uestros sedeam captiua Penates,
 dum captiua mei conspicer ora Tati!
 Romani montes, et montibus addita Roma, 35
 et ualeat probro Vesta pudenda meo!
 ille equus, ille meos in castra reponet amores
 cui Tatius dextras collocat ipse iubas.
 quid mirum in patrios Scyllam saeuisse capillos,
 candidaque in foedos inguina uersa canes? 40
 prodita quid mirum fraterni cornua monstri,
 cum patuit lecto stamine torta uia?
 quantum ego sum Ausoniis crimen factura puellis,
 improba uirgineo lecta ministra foco!
 Pallados exstinctos si quis mirabitur ignes, 45
 ignoscat: lacrimis spargitur ara meis.
 cras, ut rumor ait, tota potabitur urbe;
 tu cape spinosi rorida terga iugi.
 lubrica tota uia est et perfida; quippe latentes
 fallaci celat limite semper aquas. 50
 o utinam magicae nossem cantamina Musae!
 hanc quoque formoso lingua tulisset opem.
 te toga picta decet, non quem sine matris honore
 nutrit inhumanae dura papilla lupae.

27 cumque *Heyworth*: dumque Ω 29 Tarpeia *pro glossemate habuit Helmbold* Tarpeia
 sua *Palmer* ab: in *Heyworth* 30 uicinae . . . Iouis *Heyworth* formosa ζ:
 famosa Ω 34 ora *Gronovius*: esse Ω 35–6 *adulterinos suspicatus est Hutchinson* 37
 reponit *Hutchinson*: -at *Puccius* 39 mirum p. . . secuisse ζ 40 foedos *Heinsius*:
 saeuos Ω 47 potabitur *Palmer*: pugnabitur Ω: pigrabitur *Housman* 48 tu: tum
Rosberg 49 latentis *Rosberg*: tacentis Ω 50 semper: caespes *Palmer* 52 hanc
Baehrens: haec Ω 53 honore: amore *Hutchinson*

dic, hospes, pariamne tua regina sub aula? 55
 dos tibi non humilis prodita Roma uenit.
 si minus, at raptae ne sint impune Sabinae,
 me rape et alterna lege repende uices.
 commissas acies ego possum soluere †nuptae
 uos medium palla† foedus inite mea. 60
 adde, Hymenaeae, modos; tubicen, fera murmura conde.
 credite, uestra meus molliet arma torus.
 et iam quarta canit uenturam bucina lucem,
 ipsaque in Oceanum sidera lassa cadunt.
 experiar somnum, de te mihi somnia quaeram; 65
 fac uenias oculis umbra benigna meis.
 dixit et incerto permisit brachia somno,
 nescia se furiis accubuisse nouis.
 nam Vesta, Iliacae felix tutela fauillae,
 culpam alit et plures condit in ossa faces. 70
 illa furit qualis celerem prope Thermodonta
 Strymonis abscisso pectus aperta sinu.
 Vrbis erat festum (dixere Parilia patres),
 [hic primus coepit moenibus esse dies,
 annua pastorum conuiuia, lusus in urbe,] 75
 cum pagana madent fercula deliciis,
 cumque super †raros† faeni flammantis acervos
 traicit immundos ebria turba pedes.
 Romulus excubias decreuit in otia solui
 atque intermissa castra silere tuba. 80
 hoc Tarpeia suum tempus rata conuenit hostem;
 pacta ligat, pactis ipsa futura comes.

55 dic *Passerat*: sic Ω pariamne *N* Λ *p.o.*: patriane *ferē* Π (-nue *F*, patrare *L'*, patriaue *P*): spatierne *Housman* (-orne iam *Heinsius*) hoc in uersu alii alia 59 soluere nupta; *ferē Lütjohann* 60 medium: -ae *Shackleton Bailey*: -a *Baehrens* e.g. mediae facibus . . . meis *Hutchinson* 64 lassa ζ: lapsa Ω 68 se furiis *ed. Brix.*: nefariis Ω 69 Venus *Kraffert* 71-2 post 22 *Heyworth*, post 8.52 *Housman* 71 furit *Baehrens*: ruit Ω 72 abscissos . . . sinus *Broekhuysen* pectus *Hertzberg*: fertur Ω 73 Vrbis erat festum *Hutchinson*: urbi festus erat Ω: Vrui festus erat *Richmond* 74-5 del. *Butrica* 74 hic Π Λ *p.o.*: hi *N*: qui *Phillimore*: hinc (*hum* isse) *Heinsius* 76 deliciis ζ: diuitiis Ω: lautitiis *Postgate* 77 raros: rutilos *Hutchinson*: ternos *Butrica* 78 immundos . . . pedes ζ: -as . . . dapes Ω

mons erat ascensus dubius, festoque remissis

<

>

nec mora, uocales occupat ense canes.
 omnia †praebant somnos†; sed Iuppiter unus 85
 decreuit poenis inuigilare tuis.
 prodiderat portaeque fidem patriamque iacentem;
 nubendique petit quem uelit ipse diem.
 at Tatius (neque enim sceleri dedit hostis honorem)
 ‘nube’ ait ‘et regni scande cubile mei.’ 90
 dixit et ingestis comitum super obruit armis;
 haec, uirgo, officiis dos erat apta tuis.
 a duce Tarpeium mons est cognomen adeptus;
 o uigil, †iniustae† praemia †sortis† habes.

5

Terra tuum spinis obducatur, lena, sepulcrum,
 et tua, quod †non uis†, sentiat umbra sitim!
 nec sedeant cineri manes, et Cerberus ultor
 turpia ieiuno terreat ossa sono!
 docta uel Hippolytum Veneri mollire negantem, 5
 concordique toro pessima semper auis,
 Penelopen quoque neglecto rumore mariti
 nubere lasciuo cogeret Antinoo.
 illa uelit, poterit magnes non ducere ferrum,
 et uolucris nidis esse nouerca suis. 10
 quippe et, Collinas ad fossam mouerit herbas,
 stantia currenti diluerentur aqua.
 audax cantatae leges imponere Lunae
 et sua nocturno fallere terga lupo,

83–4 post 86 Barber 83 ascensus Jacob: -u Ω | ascensum monstrat Housman
 dubius: -um Hanstik: dapibus Jacob remissis Π: -us NΛ post 83 lac. statuit Richmond,
 post dubius Baehrens 85 praebat (pandebat Heyworth: prostrarat Hutchinson) somnus
 Markland: carpebant somnos Lütjohann sed I. unus: te I. unam Wellesley: sed I. illam
 Heyworth 86 suis ζ 88 ipse ζ: -a Ω 93 Tarpeium Palmer: -o Ω: -a ζ 94 o:
 non Peerlkamp uigil: uirgo Guyet iniustae . . . sortis (iniuste sunt qui scribant): iniusti
 (incesti maluisset Hutchinson) . . . amoris Heyworth: ista tuae . . . noctis (n. iam anon. apud
 Latinium) Hutchinson

2 non uis N^{1st}ΠΛ: non N^{1ac}: nolis Burman: nunc es Fontein: potius Hutchinson quod
 non uis: perpetuam Heyworth 3 cedant Fruter 7 quoque: quae Guyet 9 poterat
 Fontein 11 in fossa soluerit Hutchinson umbras Heinsius post 11 lac. esse suspicatus est
 Heinsius

posset ut intentos astu caecare maritos, 15
 cornicum immeritas eruit ungue genas.
 consuluitque striges nostro de sanguine et in me
 hippomanes fetae semina legit equae.
 †exorabat opus uerbis ceu blande perure
 saxosamque ferat sedula culpa uiam 20
 'si te Eoa dorozantum† iuuat aurea ripa
 et quae sub Tyria concha superbit aqua,
 Eurypyliue placet Coae textura Mineruae
 sectaque ab Attalicis †putria† signa toris,
 seu quae palmiferae mittunt uenalia Thebae 25
 murreaque in Parthis pocula cocta focis,
 sperne fidem, prouolue deos, mendacia uincant,
 frange et damnosae iura Pudicitiae!
 et simulare uirum pretium facit; utere causis.
 maior dilata nocte recurrit amor. 30
 si tibi forte comas uexauerit, utilis ira;
 postmodo mercata pace premendus erit.
 denique, ubi amplexu Venerem promiseris empto,
 fac simules puros Isidos esse dies.
 ingerat Apriles Iole tibi, tundat †Omicle† 35
 natalem Maiis Idibus esse tuum.
 supplex ille sedet: posita tu scribe cathedra
 quidlibet. has artes si pauet ille, tenes.
 semper habe morsus circa tua colla recentes
 dentibus alterius quos putet esse datos. 40
 nec te Medae delectent probra sequacis
 – nempe tulit fastus ausa rogare prior –
 sed potius mundi Thais pretiosa Menandri,
 cum ferit astutos comica moecha Getas.

15 ut 5: et Ω lac. post 18 statuit Kershaw 19 perure NFL+: peruret (uel -it)
 P+ 19–20 exorabat opes: 'tu blanda peruris (lac. ii uersuum) saxosamque terat sedula
 turba uiam Heyworth, post alios: exercebat opus tenebris, ceu blatta papyron | sufflossamque
 forat sedula talpa uiam Goold, post alios lac. post 20 statuit Guyet 21 si te: siue Hey-
 worth dorozantum N Λ p.o.: derorantum Π: topazorum Housman: lecta lapis Heyworth
 si te Eoa d.: chrysolithus si te Eoa Morgan (chr.), Reeve 23 Eurypyliue Heinsius (-is),
 Skutsch: -ique Ω 24 putria: uiuida Heyworth: lucida Hutchinson 28 frange et 5:
 frangunt Ω: frangeque Hutchinson ante 29 lac. esse suspicatus est Heyworth 29–30 et
 45–6 inuicem transtulit Goold 34 Isidos Hertzberg. sideris Ω 35 Iole: Hyale Palmer
 Omicle NstΠ Λ p.o.: Amicle N^{1ac}C: Omichle Palmer. Amycle 5 36 Maiis fere SCT: malis
 MΠ+ 37 sedet(: posita): adeat(, p.): Heinsius: fleat(, p.) Hutchinson 40 dentibus Heinsius:
 lit- Ω: lus- Guyet alterius Πf: alternis N Λ p.o. 41 nec NΛ: non Π

in mores te uerte uiri: si cantica iactat, 45
 i comes et uoces ebria iunge tuas.
 ianitor ad dantes uigilet; si pulsat inanis,
 surdus in obductam somniet usque seram.
 nec tibi displiceat miles non factus amori,
 nauta nec attrita si ferat aera manu, 50
 aut quorum titulus per barbara colla pendit,
 cretati medio cum saluere foro.
 aurum spectato, non quae manus afferat aurum.
 uersibus auditis quid nisi uerba feres?
 [quid iuuat ornato procedere, uita, capillo 55
 et tenuis Coa ueste mouere sinus?]
 qui uersus, Coae dederit nec munera uestis,
 istius tibi sit surda sine arte lyra.
 dum uernat sanguis, dum rugis integer annus,
 utere, ne quid cras libet ab ore dies. 60
 uidi ego odoratum uictura rosaria Paestum
 sub matutino cocta iacere Noto.⁷
 his animum nostrae dum uersat Acanthis amicae,
 per tenuem ossa a me sunt numerata cutem.
 sed cape torquatae, Venus o regina, columbae 65
 ob meritum ante tuos guttura secta focos!
 uidi ego rugoso tussim crebrescere collo,
 sputaque per dentes ire cruenta cauos,
 atque animam in tegetes putrem exspirare paternas;
 horruit argenti pergula curua foco. 70
 exsequiae fuerint rari furtiua capilli
 uincula et immundo pallida mitra situ,
 et canis, in nostros nimis experrecta dolores,
 cum fallenda meo pollice clatra forent.

45-6 *adulterinos duxit Hutchinson: post 28 transtulit Otto, post 48 Risberg: uide etiam ad 29-30* 47 pulsat *CIL* iv 1894: -et Ω 47-8 *post 32 esse transferendos suspicatus est Heyworth* 48 in obductam . . . seram *CIL* iv 1894, Ω: ad -am . . . -am *Kenney: in a . . . -a Markland* 50 feret *Hutchinson* aera *P^{bc}* ∧ *p.o.*: acra *MT* 52 cretati *Passerat*: celati Ω 55-6 (= 1.2.1-2) *om.* ζ 58 istius ζ: ipsius Ω arte *ΠC*: aere *N* ∧ *p.o.* 61 odoratum . . . Paestum *Schippers*: -i . . . -i Ω 63 animum *R*: -us *NLP* ∧ *p.o.*: -is *F* 64 tenuem . . . cutem *Jacob*: -es . . . -es Ω <a me> *Barber*: <mihi> *Jacob* 65-6, *hoc modo scriptos*: sed (cape . . . focos), ante 63-4 *transtulit Shackleton Bailey* 67 crebrescere *Housman*: concrescere Ω 70 curta ζ 71 fuerint *Graevius*: fuerant Ω: fuerunt *Passerat* 73 experrecta ζ: exporr- Ω 74 clatra *Beroaldus*: caltra *ferre* Ω: claustra ζ

sit tumulus lenae curto uetus amphora collo;
 urgeat hunc supra uis, caprifice, tua.
 quisquis amas, scabris hoc bustum caedite saxis,
 mixtaque cum saxis addite uerba mala!

6

Sacra facit uates; sint ora fauentia sacris,
 et cadat ante meos icta iuuenca focos.
 serta Philiteis certet Romana corymbis,
 et Cyrenacas urna ministret aquas.
 costum molle date et blandi mihi turis honores,
 terque focum circa laneus orbis eat.
 spargite me lymphis; carmenque recentibus aris
 tibia Mygdoniis libet eburna cadis.
 ite procul, fraudes; alio sint aere noxae.
 pura nouum uati laurea mollit iter.
 Musa, Palatini referemus Apollinis aedem;
 res est, Calliope, digna fauore tuo.
 Caesaris in nomen ducuntur carmina; Caesar
 dum canitur, quaeso, Iuppiter ipse uaces.
 est Phoebi fugiens Athamana ad litora portus,
 qua sinus Ioniae murmura condit aquae,
 †Actia Iuleae pelagus monumenta carinae,
 nautarum uotis non operosa uia;†
 huc mundi coiere manus. stetit aequore moles
 pinea, nec remis aequa fauebat auis:
 altera classis erat Teucro damnata Quirino,
 pilaque femineae turpiter apta manu;
 hinc Augusta ratis plenis Iouis omine uelis
 signaque iam patriae uincere docta suae.
 tandem aciem geminos Nereus lunarat in arcus,
 armorum et radiis picta tremebat aqua,
 cum Phoebus, linquens stantem se uindice Delon
 (nam tulit iratos mobilis ante Notos),

77 hoc: huic *Heinsius* caedite *Liuius*: -o Ω

1 *carmen nouum et hic et post 10 incipiunt N+*: post 10 tantum Π+ 3 *serta Scaliger*: cera
 Ω certent (*Scaliger*) . . . grana *Heyworth* Philiteis ζ: Philippeis Ω 8 cadis: modis
 ζ 17-18 *adulterinos suspicatus est Hutchinson* 17 pelagus: Leucas *Markland*: pandens
Fea: celebrant *Heyworth* 18 non operosa uia: nunc onerata uia est (est *P*) *Carutti* (nunc),
Heyworth 22 femineae *Markland*: -a Ω apta: acta ζ 25 Nereus TST: neruis MT+
 lunarat FA: limarat fere NPL 26 icta *Dausqueius* 28 nam: non ζ ante *Lipsius*:
 unda Ω: una ζ

astitit Augusti puppim super, et noua flamma
 luxit in obliquam ter sinuata facem. 30
 non ille attulerat crines in colla solutos
 aut testudineae carmen inerme lyrae,
 sed quali aspexit Pelopeum Agamemnona uultum
 egessitque auidis Dorica castra rogis,
 aut quali flexos soluit Pythona per orbes 35
 serpentem, imbelles quem timuere †lyrae†.
 mox ait, 'o Longa mundi seruator ab Alba,
 Auguste, Hectoreis cognite maior auis,
 uince mari: iam terra tua est. tibi militat arcus
 et fauet ex umeris hoc onus omne meis. 40
 solue metu patriam, quae nunc, te uindice freta,
 imposuit prorae publica uota tuae.
 quam nisi defendes, murorum Romulus augur
 ire Palatinas non bene uidit aues.
 ah nimium remis audent! pro turpe Latinis 45
 principe te fluctus regia uela pati!
 nec te quod classis centenis remigat alis
 terreat: inuito labitur illa mari;
 quotque uehant prorae Centauros saxa minantes
 tigna caua et pictos experire metus. 50
 frangit et attollit uires in milite causa;
 quae nisi iusta subest, excutit arma pudor.
 tempus adest; committe rates. ego temporis auctor
 ducam laurigera Iulia rostra manu.'
 dixerat, et pharetrae pondus consumit in arcus; 55
 proxima post arcus Caesaris hasta fuit.
 uincit Roma fide Phoebi; dat femina poenas.
 sceptrum per Ionias fracta uehantur aquas.
 at pater Idalio miratur Caesar ab astro:
 'sum deus: est nostri sanguinis ista fides.' 60
 prosequitur cantu Triton, omnesque marinae
 plauserunt circa libera signa deae.

33 uultum *Rossberg*: -u Ω 34 egessitque ζ: egissetque Ω 35 quali *Rossberg*: -is Ω 36
 lyrae: deae *Willemott*: chori *Paley*: ferae *Sterke* 43 augur: auctor ζ 45 ah *Kershaw*: et
 Ω: heu *idem Kershaw*: en ζ pro ζ: prope Ω Latinos *Markland* 47 remigat ζ:
 -et Ω 49 quotque ζ: quodque *NFL* Λ: quique *L²P* Centauros *Guyet*: -ria *N^{oe}* +:
 -rica *N^{oe}* Π+ 55 arcus: hostes *Heyworth et Hutchinson* 59-60 *del. L. Bernays* 60 tu
 meus, et *Baehrens*: tu deus es *Richter* est: en ζ sanguinis: numinis *Heyworth* iste
Markland

illa petit Nilum, cumba male nixa fugaci,
 hoc unum, iusso non moritura die.
 di melius! quantus mulier foret una triumphus, 65
 ductus erat per quas ante Iugurtha uias!
 Actius hinc traxit Phoebus monumenta, quod eius
 una decem uicit missa sagitta rates.
 bella satis cecini; citharam iam poscit Apollo,
 uictor et ad placidos exuit arma choros. 70
 candida nunc molli subeant conuiuia luco,
 blanditaeque fluant per mea colla rosae,
 uinaque fundantur prelis elisa Falernis,
 perluat et nostras spica Cilissa comas.
 ingenium potis irriteret Musa poetis: 75
 Bacche, soles Phoebo fertilis esse tuo.
 ille paludosos memoret seruire Sugambros;
 Cepheam hic Meroen fuscaque regna canat;
 hic referat sero confessum foedere Parthum:
 'reddit signa Remi; mox dabit ipse sua. 80
 siue aliquid pharetris Augustus parceret Eois,
 differet in pueros ista tropaea suos.
 gaude, Crasse, nigras si quid sapis inter harenas:
 ire per Euphraten ad tua busta licet.'
 sic noctem patera, sic ducam carmine, donec 85
 iniciat radios in mea uina dies.

7

Sunt aliquid manes; letum non omnia finit,
 luridaque exstructos effugit umbra rogos.
 Cynthia namque meo uisa est incumbere fulcro,
 Tiburis extrema nuper humata uia,
 cum mihi somnus ab exsequiis penderet amoris, 5
 et quereretur lecti frigida regna mei.

64 hoc unum: occultum *Rosberg*: hoc cursu *Barber* 67-8 *del. Peerlkamp* 72 blandi-
 taeque 5: blanditiaeque 5: blandae utrimque *Lachmann* 74 perluat et *Morgan*: perque
 lauet 5 75 potis 5: positus 5 irriteret: -at *Canter* 79 hic N: haec ΠΛ con-
 strictum *Hardie*: confectum *Luineius* haec referam, 'sero confessus . . . Parthus: . . .'
Hutchinson (referam), *Slothouwer* 80 reddit 5: -at 5 81 aliquid 5: aliquis 5: aequus
Housman 82 differet *Francius*: differat 5
 2 exstructos 5: euinctos N: eiunctos *LPI²Λ*: euictos *F^{ac}*: extinctos *Passerat* 4 Tiburis
 extrema . . . uia *Carutti*: murmur ad extremae . . . uiae 5: Tibure ad extremam . . . uiam
Housman: murmur ad extremae . . . tubae *Housman*

eosdem habuit secum quibus est elata capillos,
 eosdem oculos. lateri uestis adusta fuit,
 et solitum digito beryllon adederat ignis;
 summaque Lethaeus triuerat ora liquor. 10
 spirantesque animos et uocem misit, et illi
 pollicibus fragiles increpuere manus:
 'perfide, nec cuiquam melior sperande puellae,
 in te iam uires somnus habere potest?
 iamne tibi exciderunt uigilacis furta Suburae 15
 et mea nocturnis trita fenestra dolis?
 per quam demisso quotiens tibi fune pependi,
 alterna ueniens in tua colla manu!
 saepe Venus triuio commissa, et pectore mixto
 fecerunt tepidas pallia nostra uias. 20
 foederis heu †taciti†, cuius fallacia uerba
 non audituri diripuerunt Noti!
 at mihi non oculos quisquam inclamauit euntes;
 unum impetrassem te reuocante diem.
 nec crepuit fissa me propter harundine custos, 25
 laesit et obiectum tegula curta caput.
 denique quis nostro curuum te funere uidit,
 atram quis lacrimis incaluisse togam?
 si piguit portas ultra procedere, at illuc
 iussisses lectum lentius ire meum. 30
 cur uentos non ipse rogis, ingrata, petisti?
 cur nardo flammae non oluere meae?
 hoc etiam graue erat, nulla mercede hyacinthos
 inicere, et fracto busta piare cado?
 Lygdamus uratur; candescat lamina uernae. 35
 sensi ego cum insidiis pallida uina bibi.
 ut Nomas arcanas tollat uersuta saliuas,
 dicet damnatas ignea testa manus.
 quae modo per uiles inspecta est publica noctes,
 haec nunc aurata cyclade signat humum. 40

7 eosdem 5: hosdem Ω capillos P. -is NFLA 11 et *Luineius*: at Ω 15 exciderunt
 5: -ant Ω 19 triuio est *Heyworth* commissa 5: -mixta Ω 20 pallia NA: pectora Π:
 proelia anon. apud *Liijohann* 21 taciti: pacti *Palmer*: pactum *Hutchinson* 23 at: ei *Page*.
 nam *Hutchinson* clamauit *Heyworth* euntes: eunti *Reland*: hebentes *Barber* 25 ac
Jacob 33 hocne *Hall* erit Π ante 35 lac. esse suspicatus est *Heyworth* 37 ut 5: aut
 Ω saliuas 5: salinas NFLA p.o.: sabinas PS

at grauiora rependit iniquis pensa quasillis,
 garrula de facie si qua locuta mea est.
 nostraque quod Petale tulit ad monumenta coronas,
 codicis immundi uincula sentit anus.
 caeditur et Lalage, tortis suspensa capillis, 45
 per nomen quoniam est ausa rogare meum.
 te patiente, meae conflauit imaginis aurum,
 ardente e nostro dotem habitura rogo.
 non tamen insector, quamuis mereare, Properti:
 longa mea in libris regna fuere tuis. 50
 iuro ego Fatorum nulli reuolubile carmen,
 tergeminusque canis sic mihi molle sonet,
 me seruasse fidem. si fallo, uipera nostris
 sibilet in tumulis et super ossa cubet.
 nam gemina est sedes turpem sortita per amnem, 55
 turbaque diuersa remigat omnis aqua.
 †una Clytaemestrae stuprum uehit, altera Cressae
 portat mentitae lignea monstra bouis.
 ecce coronato pars altera parta phaselo, †
 mulcet ubi Elysias aura beata rosas, 60
 qua numerosa fides, quaque aera rotunda Cybebes
 mitratisque sonant Lydia plectra choris.
 Andromedeque et Hypermestre, sine fraude maritae,
 narrant historias, pectora sancta, suas.
 haec sua maternis queritur liuere catenis 65
 brachia, nec meritas frigida saxa manus;
 narrat Hypermestre magnum ausas esse sorores,
 in scelus hoc animum non ualuisse suum.
 sic mortis lacrimis uitae sanamus amara;
 celo ego perfidiae crimina multa tuae. 70
 sed tibi nunc mandata damus, si forte moueris,
 si te non totum Chloridos herba tenet.

41 at *Markland*: et Ω rependit *NA*: fundit *FL*: effundit *P*: imponit *Hutchinson* 51
 carmen *om*. *L*: stamen ζ: nemen *Postgate* 55 gemina est: geminas *Passerat* 57-9 (*uel*
 57-8) *uersus adulterinos quidem, sed e genuinis confectos pluribus, suspicatus est Hutchinson* 57
 una: unda *Hertzberg*: cumba *Rossberg* Clytaemestram *Lütjohann* Cressam . . . men-
 titam *Haupt* 58 portans *Müller* bouis: bouem *Postgate* 59 parta: uecta ζ: rapta
Palmer 61 quaque aera rotunda *Turnebus*: qua querar (-at ΠΥ) ut unda *fere* Ω 63
 marita *Heinsius* 64 narrant: maerent *Stroh* historias . . . suas *Markland*: -ae . . . -ae Ω
 pectora: foedera *Heinsius* sancta *Housman*: nota Ω 65 sua maternis ζ: summa aeter-
 nis Ω 69 sanamus: sancimus *Rossberg* amara *Markland*: amores Ω 71 sed: haec
Heinsius

nutrix in tremulis ne quid desideret annis
 Parthenie: potuit nec tibi auara fuit.
 deliciaeque meae Latris, cui nomen ab usu est – 75
 ne speculum dominae porrigat illa nouae.
 et quoscumque meo fecisti nomine uersus
 ure mihi; laudes desine habere meas.
 pelle hederam tumulo, mihi ne praegnante corymbo
 mollia contortis alliget ossa comis. 80
 ramosis Anio qua pomifer incubat aruis,
 et numquam, Herculeo numine, pallet ebur;
 hoc carmen media, dignum me, scribe columna,
 sed breue, quod currens uector ab urbe legat:
 “†sed tiburna iacet hic† aurea Cynthia terra; 85
 accessit ripae laus, Aniene, tuae.”
 nec tu sperne piis uenientia somnia portis:
 cum pia uenerunt, somnia pondus habent.
 nocte uagae ferimur, nox clausas liberat umbras,
 errat et abiecta Cerberus ipse sera. 90
 luce iubent leges Lethaea ad stagna reuerti;
 nos uehimur, uectum nauta recenset onus.
 nunc te possideant aliae; mox sola tenebo.
 mecum eris, et mixtis ossibus ossa teram.’
 haec postquam querula mecum sub lite peregit, 95
 inter complexus excidit umbra meos.

8

Disce quid Esquilias hac nocte fugarit aquosas,
 cum uicina nouis turba cucurrit agris.
 Lanuuium annosi uetus est tutela draconis.
 hic tibi tam rarae non perit hora morae;
 †qua† sacer abripitur caeco descensus hiatu, 5
 qua penetrat – uirgo, tale iter omne caue –

79 pelle: pone *anon.* ne *Kenney*: quae Ω praegnante *Cornelissen*: pugnante Ω 80
 mollia ζ: -li Ω: -lis ζ alliget *anon.*: -at Ω 81 pomosis . . . spumifer *Broekhuysen* 83
 hoc Π: hic *NA* 85 sed Tiburna (Tiburtina *FP*) iacet hic *ferē* Ω: hic Tiburtina iacet *P^c*: hic
 sita Tiburna iacet *Palmer* hic: hac ζ 88 uenerunt, somnia *dist. Hutchinson*: uenerunt
 somnia, *edd.* 90 [et] reiecta *Hutchinson*
 4 tibi ζ: ubi *ferē* Ω rapae *N^{ac}*: gratae *Housman* 5 qua: nam *Heyworth*: hic *Hutchinson*
 est sacer abruptus (abr. *iam Heinsius*) *Hutchinson* 6 qua: hac *Heinsius* uirgo (tale iter
 omen habet) *Housman*

ieiuni serpentis honos, cum pabula poscit
 annua, et ex ima sibila torquet humo.
 talia demissae pallent ad sacra puellae
 cum tenera anguino raditur ore manus. 10
 ille sibi admotas a uirgine corripit escas;
 uirginis in palmis ipsa canistra tremunt.
 si fuerunt castae, redeunt in colla parentum,
 clamantque agricolae 'fertilis annus erit!'
 huc mea detonsis auecta est Cynthia mannis. 15
 causa fuit Iuno; sed mage causa Venus.
 Appia, dic, quaeso, quantum te teste triumphum
 egerit effusis per tua saxa rotis.
 [turpis in arcana sonuit cum rixa taberna,
 si sine me, famae non sine labe meae.] 20
 spectaculum ipsa sedens primo temone pependit,
 ausa per impuros frena mouere iocos.
 †siriganam† taceo uulsi carpenta nepotis
 atque armillatos colla Molossa canes.
 qui dabit immundae uenalia fata saginae, 25
 uincet ubi erasas barba pudenda genas.
 cum fieret nostro totiens iniuria lecto,
 mutato uolui castra mouere toro.
 Phyllis Auentinae quaedam est uicina Dianae,
 sobria grata parum; cum bibit omne decet. 30
 altera Tarpeios inter stat Teia lucos,
 candida, sed potae non satis unus erit.
 his ego constitui noctem lenire uocatis
 et Venere ignota furta nouare mea.
 unus erat tribus in secreta lectulus herba. 35
 quaeris discubitus; inter utramque fui.

8 ima *P^cΛ*: una *NLF* 9–10 *post 12 transtulit Housman* 10 tenera *ζ*: temere *Ω*: trepida
Heyworth raditur *Cornelissen*: creditur *Ω* 13 fuerunt *FT^{il}*: -int *NLP* *Λ p.o.* 15
 mannis *ζ*: ab annis *Ω* 19–20 *del. Butler. post 2 transtulit Lütjohann* 22 iocos *Λ*: locos
ΜΠ 23 siriganam: serica nam *ζ*: sed uaga iam *Bonazzi* taceo *ζ*: tacto *Ω* sic
 auriga trahit *Pontanus*: Gallica nec (non iam *ζ*) taceas *Hutchinson* nepotis *ζ*: -ti *Ω* 26
 ubi: et *Hutchinson* pudenda *NΛ*: put- *Π*: pig- *Hall* 28 mutato *ζ*: mult- *Ω* uolui
ζ: -it *Ω* 31 inter stat *Heyworth et Hutchinson*: inter *N*, tum spatium, ubi man. rec. est inseruit:
 est inter (*post quod in LJK spatium*) *ΠΛ* 35 herba: umbra *Heinsius* 36 discubitus *Palmer*:
 con- *Ω* utramque *L^{bc}P^{bc}Λ p.o.*: utraque *ΜΠ*

Lygdamus ad cyathos, uitrique aestiua supellex,
 et Methymnaei grata saliuā meri.
 Nile, tuus tibicen erat, crotalistria †Phyllist†;
 et facilis spargi munda sine arte rosa. 40
 nanus et, ipse suos breuiter contractus in artus,
 iactabat truncas ad caua buxa manus.
 sed neque suppletis constabat flamma lucernis,
 reccidit inque suos mensa supina pedes.
 me quoque per talos Venerem quaerente secundam, 45
 semper damnosi subsiluire canes.
 cantabant surdo; nudabant pectora caeco:
 Lanuui ad portas, ei mihi, solus eram –
 cum subito rauci sonuerunt cardine postes,
 nec leuia ad primos murmura facta lares. 50
 nec mora cum totas resupinat Cynthia ualuas,
 non operosa comis, sed furibunda decens.
 pocula mi digitos inter cecidere remissos;
 palluerunt ipso labra soluta mero.
 fulminat illa oculis, et quantum femina saeuit; 55
 spectaclum capta nec minus urbe fuit.
 Phyllidos iratos in uultum conicit ungues;
 territa, uicinis Teia clamat 'aquam!'
 †lumina† sopitos turbant elata Quirites,
 omnis et insana semita uoce sonat. 60
 illas, direptisque comis tunicisque solutis,
 excipit obscurae prima taberna uiae.
 Cynthia gaudet in exuuiis, uictrixque recurrit,
 et mea †peruersa† sauciat ora manu,
 imponitque notam collo morsuque cruentat, 65
 praecipueque oculos, qui meruere, ferit.

37 uitrique *Scaliger*: utrique *NA*: uterque *Π* 38 grata *ς*: Graeca *Ω* 39 Nile,
 tuus: Miletus *Palmer* crotalistria *Turnebus*: coral-ferē *Π*+: eboral- *N*: crotalistris *coni. Hey-*
worth Phyllis: Orontes *Morgan*: Byblis *Palmer*: Hibera *Hutchinson* 40 et: haec *Baehrens*
 41 nanus *ς*: magnus *Ω* contractus *ς*: concretus *Ω* 44 suos: meos *Heyworth* (adque
 meos *maluisset Hutchinson*) 45 secundam *Palmer*: -o *Ω*: -os *ς* 48 solus: totus *Kuypers*
 49 subiti aerato *Heinsius* (rauco *maluisset Hutchinson*) 50 nec *ς*: et *Ω* 51 cum *NFL*:
 tum *LP* 52 comas *Broekhuysen* 54 palluerunt *Liuius*: -ant *Ω* 58 uicinis *Barber*:
 -as *Ω*: 'uicini' *Palmer* aquam *Palmer*: aquas *Ω* 59 lumina: iurgia *Baehrens*: murmura
anon. ap. Burman: crimina *Gool* 60 uoce *Fruter*: nocte *Ω* 64 peruersa: uesana *Heinsius*:
 purpurea *Hutchinson*

atque ubi iam nostris lassauit brachia plagis,

Lygdamus, ad plutei fulcra sinistra latens,
eruitur, geniumque meum prostratus adorat.

Lygdame, nil potui: tecum ego captus eram.
supplicibus palmis tum demum ad foedera ueni

70

cum uix tangendos praebuit illa pedes.

atque ait 'admissae si uis me ignoscere culpaе,
accipe quae nostrae formula legis erit.

tu neque Pompeia spatiabere cultus in umbra,
nec cum lascium sternet harena forum.

75

colla caue inflectas ad summum obliqua theatrum,
aut lectica tuae se det aperta morae.

Lygdamus imprimis, omnis mihi causa querelae,
ueneat et pedibus uincula bina trahat.'

80

indixit leges; respondi ego 'legibus utar'.

riserat imperio facta superba rato.

dein quemcumque locum externaе tetigere puellae
suffiit, et pura limina tergit aqua.

imperat et totas iterum mutare lucernas,

85

terque meum tetigit sulphuris igne caput.

atque ita, mutato per singula pallia lecto,

†respondi†, et toto soluimus arma toro.

9

Amphitryoniades qua tempestate iuuenos

egerat a stabulis, o Erythea, tuis,

uenit ad inuictos, pecorosa Palatia, montes,

et statuit fessos fessus et ipse boues,

qua Velabra suo stagnabant flumine quaque

5

nauta per urbanas uelificabat aquas.

sed non infido manserunt hospite Caco

incolumes: furto polluit ille Iouem.

68 fulcra ζ : fusca Ω 69 prostratus Λ p.o. (-latus C): -tractus \mathcal{M} 71 ueni T^*C : uenit
 Π Λ p.o.: om. \mathcal{N} 76-8 et (*Liuius*) . . . forum, | colla . . . nec lectica *Lipsius* 78 se det
Gruter: sudet Ω : nudet *Koch* operta ζ 81 leges T : legem \mathcal{M} Λ p.o. 82 riserat Ω :
risit at *Burman* (et *Heyworth*) rato *Heinsius*: dato Ω 84 suffiit et ζ : sufficat Ω : suffiit at
Hertzberg tersit *Hardie* 85 et totas: exstinctas *Hutchinson* lucernas \mathcal{NA} : lac-fere Π
88 respondi: lis posita *Baehrens*: res pacta *Müller*: despondi *Pucci* noto *Heinsius*
3 ad inuictos ζ : et aduictos \mathcal{NA} : et adiutos F : et ad iunctos LP^* 4 fessas *Markland* 5
flumine ζ : -na \mathcal{N} : fulmine Π quoque ζ

incola Cacus erat, metuendo raptor ab antro,
 per tria partitos qui dabat ora sonos. 10
 hic, ne certa forent manifestae signa rapinae,
 auersos cauda traxit in antra boues.
 nec sine teste deo furtum: sonuere iuueni;
 furis et implacidas diruit ira fores.
 Maenalio iacuit pulsus tria tempora ramo 15
 Cacus, et Alcides sic ait: 'ite boues,
 Herculis ite boues, nostrae labor ultime clauae,
 bis mihi quaesitae, bis mea praeda, boues,
 aruaque mugitu sancite boaria longo:
 nobile erit Romae pascua uestra forum.' 20
 dixerat, et sicco torquet sitis ora palato,
 terraque non ullas feta ministrat aquas.
 sed procul inclusas audit ridere puellas,
 lucus ubi umbroso saepserat orbe nemus,
 Femineae loca clausa Deae fontesque piandos 25
 impune et nullis sacra relecta uiris.
 deuia puniceae uelabant limina uitae;
 putris odorato luxerat igne casa.
 populus et longis ornabat frondibus aedem,
 multaque cantantes umbra tegebat aues. 30
 huc ruit in siccam congesta puluere barbam,
 et iacit ante fores uerba minora deo:
 'uos precor, o luci sacro quae luditis antro,
 pandite defessis hospita fana uiris.
 fontis egens erro circum antra sonantia lymphis; 35
 et caua suscepto flumine palma sat est.
 audistisne aliquem tergo qui sustulit orbem?
 ille ego sum: Alciden terra recepta uocat.

9-12 *adulterinos suspicatus est Hutchinson* 9 incola ζ : insula Ω : accola *Schrader* 10 par-
 titos in *dubium* uocauit *Heyworth* 11 manifestaue *Luck* 12 auersas *Markland* 13 dei
Hutchinson furtum *Heyworth*: furem *fere* Ω 14 at *Guyet* 18 quaesiti *Heyworth* 20
 erunt ζ 21 et: at *Housman* torret ζ 22 ullas *SW*: nullas *MT* Λ *p.o.*: uiuas *Richmond*
 ministrat *W*: -et *MT* Λ *p.o.* 24 lucus: murus *Fontein* ubi *Heinsius*: ab Ω saepserat
Fontein: fecerat Ω 28 putris: turis *Heinsius* 29 longis: densis *Fontein*: glaucis *Housman*
 31 congesta *NL* Λ *p.o.*: -am *P*: -iesta *F*: coniecto *Bonazzi*: conlecta *Hutchinson* 33 luci ζ :
 lucis Ω 34 fana *Scaliger*: uana Ω uiris ζ : uiis *MT* Λ *p.o.* 35 circum antra *Burman*:
 circaue Ω : circa arua *Baehrens* 38 recepta Π +: suscepta *N*+.

quis facta Herculeae non audit fortia clauae,
 et numquam ad uastas irrita tela feras, 40
 atque uni Stygias homini luxisse tenebras
 [accipit? at fesso uix mihi terra patet]
 < >
 quod si Iunoni sacrum faceretis amarae,
 non clausisset aquas ipsa nouerca suas.
 sin aliquam uultusque meus saetaeque leonis 45
 terrent et Libyco sole perusta coma,
 idem ego Sidonia feci seruilia palla
 officia et Lydo pensa diurna colo;
 mollis et hirsutum cepit mihi fascia pectus,
 et manibus duris apta puella fui.' 50
 talibus Alcides, at talibus alma sacerdos,
 puniceo canas stamine uincta comas:
 'parce oculis, hospes, lucoque abscede uerendo,
 cede agedum, et tuta limina linque fuga.
 interdicta uiris metuenda lege piatur 55
 quae se summota uindicat ara casa.
 magno Tiresias aspexit Pallada uates
 fortia dum posita Gorgone membra lauat.
 di tibi dent alios fontes; haec lympa puellis
 auia secreti limitis unda fluit.' 60
 sic anus; ille umeris postes concussit opacos.
 nec tulit iratam ianua clausa sitim.
 at postquam exhausto iam flumine uicerat aestum,
 ponit uix siccis tristia iura labris:
 ['angulus hic mundi nunc me mea fata trahentem 65
 accipit; haec fesso uix mihi terra patet.]
 'maxima quae gregibus deuota est ara repertis,
 ara per has' inquit 'maxima facta manus,
 haec nullis umquam pateat ueneranda puellis,
 Herculis †extermium† ne sit inulta sitis.' 70

40 uastas ς : uatas *NLT*: natas *FP* \wedge *p.o.*: notas ς 42 del. ς at noluit *Heyworth*: et *N*: haec
 fere *PA* (cf. 66) haec . . . tecta patent *Weidgen* 65–6 ante 43 transtulit *Jacob* 43 etsi
Heyworth 45 aliquam *P*: -em *NFLA*: autem *Heyworth* 49 cepit: cinxit *Francius* 57
 magno ς : -am Ω 60 unda *Housman*: una Ω fluit *Fruter*: fuit Ω 65–6 del. *Lütjohann*:
 ante 43 transtulit *Jacob* 65 nunc: non *Helmbold* 70 extermium *NFL* \wedge *p.o.*: extremum
P: externi *Heinsius*: exclusi *Owen*: aeternum ς ne sit *PT*^{ms}: nescit *NFL* \wedge *p.o.*

sancte pater, salue, cui iam fauet aspera Iuno.
 Sance, uelis libro dexter inesse meo.
 [hunc, quoniam manibus purgatum sanxerat orbem,
 sic Sancum Tatiae composuere Cures.]

10

Nunc Iouis incipiam causas aperire Feretri,
 armaque de ducibus trina recepta tribus.
 magnum iter ascendo, sed dat mihi gloria uires;
 non iuuat e facili lecta corona iugo.
 imbuis exemplum primae tu, Romule, palmae 5
 huius, et exuuio plenus ab hoste redis,
 tempore quo portas Caeninum Acrona petentem
 uictor in euersum cuspidis fundis equum.
 Acron, Hercules Caenina ductor ab arce,
 Roma, tuis quondam finibus horror erat. 10
 hic, spolia ex umeris ausus sperare Quirini,
 ipse dedit, sed non sanguine sicca suo.
 hunc uidet ante cauas librantem spicula turre
 Romulus, et uotis occupat ante ratis:
 ‘Iuppiter, hic hodie tibi uictima corruiet Acron.’ 15
 uouerat, et spoliū corruiet ille Ioui.
 Urbis uirtutisque parens sic uincere sueuit,
 qui tulit a parco frigida castra lare.
 idem equus et frenis, idem fuit aptus aratris,
 et galea hirsuta compta lupina iuba. 20
 picta neque inducto fulgebat parma pyropo:
 praebebant caesi baltea lenta boues.
 Cossus at insequitur Veientis caede Tolumni,
 uincere cum Veios posse laboris erat.
 [necdum ultra Tiberim belli sonus: ultima praeda 25
 Nomentum et captae iugera terna Corae.]

71-2 *del. Knoche* 72 Sance *Richmond*: sancte Ω 73-4 *del. Richardson*: ante 72 transtulit
 Passerat 73 manibus: monstis *Heyworth* 74 Sancum ζ: sanctum Ω
 5 primus *van Jever* 6 huius: primus *Phillimore* et: ut *Phillimore* exuuuīs ζ: exuuuī
Hutchinson (palmae, | h. et exuuuī) 7 Acrona ζ: -onta Ω 8 in euersum ζ: nec uersum
 Ω 10 moenibus *Fontein* 13 uibrantem ζ 14 ratis ζ: rates Ω 15 hic *P*: haec
NFLA corruiet *Heinsius* 18 a parco *Jacob*: a porco *MT*: aprico *Λ*: e paruo *Müller*
 19 equus et *Guyet*: eques et Ω: aequae *Heyworth olim*: equus huic *Hutchinson* 19, 22 (| sed),
 21, 20 *hoc ordine Baehrens* 21 pyropo ζ: piroto Ω 23 inficitur *Phillimore* 25-6 *del.*
Heyworth: post 22 transtulit *Passerat*, post 8 *Richmond* 26 captae ζ: -a Ω terna ζ: terra
 Ω

heu, Veii ueteres! et uos tum regna fuistis
 et uestro posita est aurea sella foro;
 nunc intra muros pastoris bucina lenti
 cantat, et in uestris ossibus arua metunt. 30
 forte super portae dux Veius astitit arcem,
 colloquiumque sua †fretus† ab urbe dedit.
 dumque aries murum cornu pulsabat aeno
 uineaque adductum longa tegebat opus,
 Cossus ait ‘forti melius concurrere campo.’ 35
 nec mora fit; plano sistit uterque gradum.
 di Latias iuuere manus: desecta Tolumni
 ceruix Romanos sanguine lauit equos.
 Claudius Eridanum traiectos arcuit hostes,
 Belgica cui uasti parma relata ducis, 40
 Virдумari. genus hic Brenno iactabat ab ipso,
 nobilis †erecti† fundere gaesa rotis.
 illi uirgatas maculanti sanguine bracas
 torquis ab incisa decidit unca gula.
 haec spolia in templo tria condita. causa Feretri 45
 omine quod certo dux ferit ense ducem;
 seu quia uicta suis umeris haec arma ferebant,
 hinc Feretri dicta est ara superba Iouis.

II

Desine, Paille, meum lacrimis urgere sepulcrum:
 panditur ad nullas ianua nigra preces.

27 heu *Lütjohann*: e *NF* \wedge *p.o.*: et *LPT*^{sl}: o ζ : a *Baehrens* tum: quoque *Heinsius* 30
 ossibus arma ζ : finibus ossa *Heyworth* 31 portam . . . arcis *Heyworth* *Veiens Dempster*
 32 sua: suis *Barber*: astu *Phillimore* fretus: cautus *Henry*: uersus *Hutchinson* ab hoste
 petit *Heyworth* (petit iam *Heinsius*) 34 -que adductum *Hutchinson*: qua ductum Ω : -que
 inductum ζ : -que inceptum *Heyworth* 35 fortis *Markland*: fortem *Hutchinson* 36 sistit:
 figit *Markland* gradum ζ : -u Ω 39 Eridanum *Guyet*: a Rheno Ω : Eridano *Passerat*:
 at Rheno *Barber* 40 bellica *Passerat* cui *Guyet*: cum Ω 41 Virдумari ζ : Vir-
 tomani *fere* Ω : Virdomari ζ : indomitum *Heinsius* Brenno ζ : Rheno Ω 42 nobilis ζ :
 mobilis Ω erecti *NA*: effecti Π : euctis *Rothstein*: e rectis *Canter*: aeratis *Heinsius*: inuictis
Hutchinson gaesa ζ : caesa Ω 43 uirgatas maculanti sanguine bracas *Waardenburgh*:
 uirgatis iaculantis ab agmine bracis *fere* Ω illi: spicula *Heinsius* 44 excisa *Hutchinson*
 45 haec *P*: nec *FL*: nunc *NA* 46 omine *N+*: crimine $\Pi+$: numine *Baehrens* nominis
 haec *Heinsius* ense: ipse *Damsté* 47 uota *Phillimore* huc *Broekhuysen* 48 haec
Heyworth: sic *Heinsius*

1, 6, 3, 2, 5, 4, 7, 8 *hoc ordine Boot*: 1, 6, 7, 4, 5, 2, 3, 8 *Goold*

cum semel infernas intrarunt funera sedes,
 non exorando stant adamante uiae.
 te licet orantem fuscae deus audiat aulae, 5
 nempe tuas lacrimas litora surda bibent.
 uota mouent superos: ubi portitor aera recepit,
 obserat †herbosos† lurida porta †rogos†.
 sic maestae cecinere tubae, cum subdita nostrum
 detraheret lecto fax inimica caput. 10
 quid mihi coniugium Paulli, quid currus auorum
 profuit, aut famae pignora tanta meae?
 num minus immites habuit Cornelia Parcas?
 en sum quod digitis quinque legatur onus.
 damnatae nocti †et uos†, uada lenta, paludes, 15
 aut quaecumque meos implicat unda pedes,
 immatura licet, tamen huc non noxia ueni;
 nec precor hic umbrae mollia iura meae.
 at si quis posita iudex sedet Aeacus urna,
 is mea sortita iudicet ossa pila. 20
 assideant fratres iuxta; Minoia sella

<

>

Eumenidum intento turba seuera foro.
 Sisyphæ, mole uaces; taceant Ixionis orbes;
 fallax, Tantaleo corripere ore, liquor.
 Cerberus et nullas hodie petat improbus umbras, 25
 et iaceat tacita laxa catena sera.
 ipsa loquar pro me; si fallo, poena sororum
 infelixumeros urgeat urna meos.
 si cui fama fuit per auita tropaea decori,
 aera Numantinos †regna† loquuntur auos. 30

3 sedes *Heinsius*: leges Ω 4 exorando *Fruter*: -ato Ω 8 obsidet umbrosos (ς) lurida
 Parca locos (ς) *Markland* euersos . . . rogos *Richmond*: aetherios . . . polos *Hutchinson*
 inuida Parca *Boot* rogos: fores *Palmer* 9 sic: sat *Dousa* pater 13 num ΠΛ: non Ν
 14 en ς: et Ω leuatur ς 15 nocti *Sandbach*: noctes Ω: noctis *Butrica*: tenebris *Goold*
 et uos . . . paludes: sedes . . . Acherontis *Butrica*: Stygiae . . . paludes *Hutchinson* 16 aut
Heyworth: et Ω ulua *Schrader* 17-76 abest Ν 18 nec precor *Peerkamp*: det pater
 ΠΛ huic P 19 at ς: aut ΠΛ uindex *Camps*: durus *Heyworth* 20 is *Heinsius*: in
 ΠΛ 21 assideat ς iuxta et ς Minoida sellam ς sella et Λ lac. post 21
statuerunt Heyworth et Hutchinson 24 corripere ore *Auratus*: corripere ΠΛ 26 laxa ΛA:
 lapsa F: lassa P 27 loquar ς: loquor ΠΛ fallo ς: fallor ΠΛ 29 tropaea decori Λ:
 decora tropaei Π 30 om. F aera Λ: et LP: uersa ς regna: nostra *Palmer*: rapta
Hutchinson nostra . . . signa *Baehrens*

altera maternos exaequat turba Libones;
 et domus est titulis utraque fulta suis.
 mox, ubi iam facibus cessit praetexta maritis
 uinxit et acceptas altera uitta comas,
 iungor, Paulle, tuo sic discessura cubili 35
 ut lapide hoc uni nupta fuisse legar.
 testor maiorum cineres tibi, Roma, colendos,
 sub quorum titulis, Africa, tunsae iaces,
 †et Persen proauis stimulantem pectus Achilli
 quique tuas proauo fregit Achille domos,† 40
 me neque censurae legem moluisse, neque ulla
 labe mea nostros erubuisse focos.
 non fuit exuuiis tantis Cornelia damnum;
 quin et erat magnae pars imitanda domus.
 nec mea mutata est aetas: sine crimine tota est; 45
 uiximus insignes inter utramque facem.
 mi natura dedit leges a sanguine ductas:
 †ne† possis melior iudicis esse metu.
 quamlibet austeras de me ferat urna tabellas,
 turpior assessu non erit ulla meo, 50
 uel tu quae tardam mouisti fune Cybeben,
 Claudia, turritae rara ministra deae,
 uel cuius, sacros cum Vesta reposceret ignes,
 exhibuit uiuos carbasus alba focos.
 nec te, dulce caput, mater Scribonia, laesi. 55
 in me mutatum quid nisi fata uelis?
 maternis laudor lacrimis urbisque querelis;
 defensa et gemitu Caesaris ossa mea.
 ille sua nata dignam uixisse sororem
 increpat, et lacrimas uidimus ire deo. 60
 et tamen emerui generosos uestis honores;
 nec mea de sterili facta rapina domo.

31 materni hos Heyne Libones 5: Ligones ΠΛ ante 33 43-4 transtulit Peerlkamp
 34 aspersas Passerat 36 ut Graeuus: et ΠΛ 38 titulis: plantis Hall ante 39 lac.
 statuit Munro 39 del. Heyworth, et seruato stimulat quem Plessis: stimulat dum Goold:
 simulantem 5 40 qui tumidas Heyne: quique auctas La Penna proauos Λ 42
 nostros 5: uestros ΠΛ 43 non 5: ton ΠΛ tulit Heinsius 48 nec 5: non Hutchinson
 possem 5: potui Peerlkamp 49 quamlibet 5: quae- ΠΛ 50 assessu Muretus: assensu ΠΛ
 52 Claudia L^uP. gaudia FLΛ 53 sacros Rothstein: rasos Π: iasos Λ: castos Markland:
 sanctos Heyworth cui sacra suos Baehrens 61 mater merui Peerlkamp generosae
 Turnebus post 62 97-8 transtulit Peerlkamp

tu, Lepide, et tu, Paulle, meum post fata leuamen,
condita sunt uestra lumina nostra manu.
[uidimus et fratrem sellam geminasse curulem, 65
†consule quo facto tempore† rapta soror.]
filia, tu specimen censurae nata paternae,
fac teneas unum nos imitata uirum.
et serie fulcite genus; mihi cumba uolenti
soluitur aucturis tot mea facta meis. 70
haec est feminei merces extrema triumphii,
laudat ubi emeritum libera fama torum.
nunc tibi commendo communia pignora, natos;
haec cura et cineri spirat inusta meo.
fungere maternis uicibus pater: illa meorum 75
omnis erit collo turba ferenda tuo.
oscula cum dederis tua flentibus, adice matris:
tota domus coepit nunc onus esse tuum.
et si quid doliturus eris sine testibus illis,
cum uenient siccis oscula falle genis. 80
sat tibi sint noctes quas de me, Paulle, fatiges;
somniaque in faciem reddita †saepe† meam.
atque ubi secreto nostra ad simulacra loqueris,
ut responsurae singula uerba iace.
seu tamen aduersum mutarit ianua lectum, 85
sederit et nostro cauta nouerca toro,
coniugium, pueri, laudate et ferte paternum;
capta dabit uestris moribus illa manus.
nec matrem laudate nimis; collata priori
uertet in offensas libera uerba suas. 90
seu memor ille mea contentus manserit umbra,
et tanti cineres duxerit esse meos,

63 tu . . . tu 5: te . . . te ΠΛ 64 uestra Scaliger: uestro Λ: om. Π manu Scaliger: sinu ΠΛ
65–6 del. E. Hübner: ante 61 transtulit Koppiers, ante 37, lacuna post 36 statuta, Heyworth 66
consul quo factus Lachmann fausto Peerkamp funere Hoeufft 68 unum Λ: om. Π
69–70 post 72 transtulit Baehrens, post 96 Postgate 69 et: uos Wüthof 70 aucturis 5:
uncturis LPA: nupturis F facta 5: fata ΠΛ benefacta Hutchinson meis 5: malis
ΠΛ 72 torum Koppiers: rogam ΠΛ 73 natos: Paulle Butrica 77 matris 5: mater Ω
79 sed si Burman: etsi Hutchinson quid 5: quis Ω eris 5: erit Ω eris, sine . . .
illis! fere nunc interpungunt 81 sint N Λ p.o.: sunt ΠJK 82 reddita Graeuius: credita Ω:
condita Heyworth saepe: quaere Hutchinson 84 iace 5: tace Ω 86 cauta: torua
Heinsius: casta Burman: dura Hutchinson 87 durate Housman

discite uenturam iam nunc lenire senectam,
 caelibis ad curas nec uacet ulla uia.
 quod mihi detractum est uestros accedat ad annos: 95
 prole mea Paullum sic iuuēt esse senem.
 et bene habet: numquam mater lugubria sumpsi;
 uenit in exsequias tota caterua meas.
 causa perorata est; flentes me surgite, testes,
 dum pretium uitae grata rependat humus. 100
 moribus et caelum patuit: sum digna merendo
 cuius honoratis ossa uehantur auis.

93 lenire *amicus Willymottii*: sentire Ω 94 uacet ΠΛ: ualet N uia ΠΛ: uias N
 97-8 *post 62 transtulit Peerlkamp, post 64 Scaliger* 97-102 *ante 73 Schrader* 97 sed ζ
 lugubria sumpsi ζ: lubrigia sumptum ΝΛ: lubrica sumptum Π 99-100 *ante 73 transtulit*
Koppiers: adulterinos suspicatus est Hutchinson 99 me: iam *Heinsius* 100 rependat ζ: -it
 Ω: -et *Heyworth* 101 sum *Fruter*: sim Ω 102 umbra uehatur *Francius* auis *Heinsius*:
 aquis *MIT*: equis *P^{pc}* Λ *p.o.*

COMMENTARY

4.1: PROPERTIUS AND HOROS

The book opens with one of the liveliest and richest prologues in Augustan literature – if it is a single entity. Prologues not only prepare for what follows but present and set up surprises. Lucretius' hymn to a goddess sets up a surprise in thought (1.1–43, cf. 62–111); Hor. *Sat.* 2.1 and P. 3.1–3 set up unexpected deviations in the book from the generic pictures they draw. Tib. 1.1, conversely, seems at first itself generically surprising; it juxtaposes two worlds (1–50, 45–78) which the book interrelates. P. 4.1 surprises at first in itself: a present and first-person genre has become impersonal and historical. (In form 1–54 resemble an instructive poem about a city, like *SGO* 01/12/02 (2nd cent. BC); P. 3.22 partly anticipates.) Finally, an aetiological book is announced (55–70). Further internal surprise is produced by the abrupt warning against this plan (71–4) from the astrologer Horos (H. in the intro. and notes on this poem). After much teasing preamble, he reports a speech to the narrator by Apollo (133–46): the narrator's love and poetry are always to be combined, in what seems after books 1–3 standard elegiac fashion. This generates surprise beyond the prologue itself: a poem on a god's statue unexpectedly ensues, and 4.4 and 4.6 are also aetiological. Not until 4.7 is there some explanation of the narrator-poet's wilfulness: Cynthia is dead and has ordered the destruction of poems about her. This leads, however, to a repetition of just the kind of surprise that followed 4.1: 4.8 on Cynthia flouts her ban in 4.7. It is through its surprises that 4.1 creates an animated opposition between two ideas of elegy: one founded on P.'s past work, the other on Callimachus' *Actia* (see Intro. sections 3 and 4).

This opposition gives new paradox to the basis for 4.1 as a whole: the much-used prologue to the *Actia* itself. Instead of epic being the genre from which the Roman poet is dissuaded, it is aetiological elegy. The plurality of Callimachus' prologue had appealed to Roman poets: its use of different speakers and of conflict, and its two (possibly three) parts (fr. 1 Massimilla (+2?), 3–4) – the old man's reply to critics, including Apollo's speech to the poet, and the dream in which books 1 and 2 were largely set. Structural division is exploited in Virg. *Ecl.* 6.1–12, 64–73, but most notably in P. 3.1–3, which this prologue takes up. There the structure deflates the poet's pride, as happens more abruptly after the vaunting close to the narrator's speech in 4.1. Expatiation from the narrator in 3.1–2 (possibly one poem) is followed by the narrative 3.3, with a warning speech from Apollo and a prophetic speech from a Muse. In 4.1 expatiation from the narrator is followed by drama, and inset narrative. H.'s warning speech encloses Apollo's; the larger plot encloses a smaller version of itself (*mise en abyme*). As to speakers, in the Latin poets direct speech from a god is typically turned against the poet, who has been approaching or starting a different kind of work (3.3.5,

Virg. *Ecl.* 6.3, Hor. *C.* 4.15.1–2 etc.). The sense of conflict is greatly increased when that kind is elaborately expounded (4.1.1–70), and when the prime antagonist is not an all-knowing god but an astrologer. Towards P's *Aetia* H., criticizing the project at its inception, takes on the part not only of Apollo but of the Telchines.

The status of H. is unclear for the reader. Astrologers were often suspected, and used: for conflicting attitudes in the régime, cf. *RIC*¹ Aug. 124–30, 541–2, 544–8, Suet. *Aug.* 94.12, Dio 49.43.5, 56.25.5–6. Astrology was discussed, and familiar. Cf. e.g. Hor. *C.* 1.11, 2.17, Sen. *Rh. Suas.* 4.1–3; an ample tradition of Greek astrological poetry probably lies behind both Manilius and Dorotheus, Anubion, 'Manetho' etc. (cf. Pingree's edn. for Dorotheus; P. Oxy. 2546 and 4503–7 for Manetho and Anubion; W. and H. G. Gundel, *Astrologumena* (Wiesbaden 1966) 117–21, 155–65, 170–1). H. seems in some ways foreign, a bizarre stand-in for Apollo; but P. cuts down his use of abstruse technicality to a minimum. More importantly, H. shows a formidable rationality and structured argumentation which contrast with the narrator's more Propertian discourse. (The speeches are as if in rivalry, like the speakers' books.) H.'s knowledge and prediction, however, seem sometimes impressive, sometimes dubious. As a figure of authority, Cynthia in 4.7 is comparably uncertain; the narrator's apparent failure to obey in 4.1 is more easily accepted than if the main speaker had been Apollo forbidding in his own person now. (On astrology, see A. Bouché-Leclercq, *L'astrologie grecque* (repr. Brussels 1963), O. Neugebauer and H. B. van Hoesen, *Greek horoscopes* (Philadelphia 1959), J.-H. Abry (ed.), *Les tablettes astrologiques de Grand (Vosges)* (Lyons 1993), T. Barton, *Ancient astrology* (London 1994), B. Bakhouché, *L'astrologie à Rome* (Leuven 2002).)

Prediction is a basic aspect and issue of 4.1. Prologues often state what a work will contain; but here the central statement (55–70) is contested. It is also expanded into the beginning of a city. Around it cluster many other predictions: omens at the fall of Troy (41), Cassandra's and Apollo's prophecies (51–4, 133–46), H.'s various foretellings.

Prediction relates to the position and the changes of entities in time; *change* is another basic aspect of 4.1. Prediction and Roman change are fundamentally conjoined in Tib. 2.5, the prime model for 4.1.1–70 (both draw on *Aeneid* 8, and all on Varro, especially *De uita populi Romani*). In using the *Aetia* prologue 4.1 takes in the poet's whole life, as in Callimachus. Apollo's speech, as in Callimachus but not as in other Latin adaptations, is set before the narrator wrote anything. The narrator's life is set against the growth and transformation of Rome: he too has come from country beginnings (123–4, 129), but his ability to achieve one more literary transformation is in question. Linked to these issues, and the development of Rome, is the development of Roman literature (61–4), which allegedly ascends from rustic Ennian crudity (cf. Horace, *Epistles* 2.1).

4.1 as a whole opposes ancient and contemporary Rome; the opposition so prepared continues throughout the book. H. himself helps to embody modern Rome, not only through the world of his narratives in 89–102 but by his very

profession. Foreign religion and culture is one focus of Roman change in the poem – though the Trojan origin of Rome and many of its gods complicates the narrator's picture (cf. 39–54; even Vesta (21) is Trojan). Entangled with changes in religion are human sacrifice (Iphigenia, 109–12; Remus, 50; cf. Curtius, 149), animals in sacrificial and other roles, and the economic rise of Rome. H.'s Babylonian origin shows the spread of Rome's appeal; the narrator's Umbrian origin and Roman loyalties show her appeal and power (contrast 33–6). Umbria (63–4, 121–30), Troy (39–54, 109–18), Cassandra (51–4, 117–18), *lupercus*/Lupercus (26, 93–4) form specific links between the two parts which reinforce the larger thematic unity.

But is it one poem? It has been shown how much points to a strong link between the two parts, and how much would be lost otherwise. The first part in particular would become a much flatter piece, with no irony or twist. At the point of juncture (71–4), absence of connection produces more serious difficulties than it solves (see nn.). If there is connection, some of the work must be done by the reader. H. turns 67–70 into a rival prophecy. Though he indicates Apollo's disfavour (73), he does not elaborate explicitly – what should be apparent – how Apollo's speech on the narrator's poetry and love tells against the narrator's aetiological schemes. Rather he ends his speech, on any view, swiftly and obscurely. But such work is nothing new to the reader of P.

Connection, however, does not necessarily entail one poem. There are various gradations. The powerful scholarly support for division increasingly allows a degree of connection, even if not strong enough to fit the account above. (Cf. Murgia (1989) 265 n. 111, Heyworth on 71–150.) Many of the points made above are compatible with two firmly linked poems. The prologue to book 3 consists of three poems (or two poems, or conceivably three sections: cf. 3.1.1–6, 3.5.1–2; 25.1?). It is unclear what status the papyri assign to the parts of Callimachus' prologue (not really a single prologue): distinct poems need not be indicated by the coronis, which separated those parts and probably separated sections in the continuum of *Aetia* 1 and 2. Two sections could be imagined in 4.1: for visual demarcation within a Latin poem cf. e.g. P. Herc. 817 (W. Scott, *Fragmenta Herculanensia* (Oxford 1885) plates F and H). But even if the parts were demarcated, strong linking demands between 70 and 71 a continuity of what becomes dramatic time. The interruption in *quo ruis?* 71 is urgent; this best suits a single poem. The gods of prologues likewise interrupt within a poem. Similar too is the interlocutor who brings the satirist up short as he climactically warms to his scheme in Juv. 1.149–50; the passage illustrates how disruption across poems would be much less effective. It would be a further gain if 4.1 began that crucial feature of book 4, the narrator-poet's loss of monopoly over voicing. Precisely through its unexpectedness, 4.1 forms a microcosm of the larger whole.

Some discussions: A. Dieterich, *RhM* 55 (1900) 191–221; F. H. Sandbach, *CQ* 12 (1962) 264–71; E. Lefèvre, *WS* 79 (1966) 427–42; W. R. Nethercut, *WS N.F.* 2

(1968) 92–7; E. Courtney, *BICS* 16 (1969) 73–80; Marr (1970) 160–7; J. van Sickle, *Dialoghi di Archeologia* 8 (1974–5) 116–45; C. W. Macleod, *Collected papers* (Oxford 1983) 141–52; V. Ciaffi, *Scritti inediti o rari* (Turin 1978) 147–60; D. A. Kidd, *G&R* 26 (1979) 169–80; Montanari Caldini (1981); Stahl (1985) 255–79; Murgia (1989); G. B. Conte, *Genres and readers* (Baltimore 1994) 122–3; K. S. Rothwell, *Eranos* 55 (1996) 829–54; R. H. A. Jenkyns, *Virgil's Experience* (Oxford 1998) 608–14; C. Edwards, *Writing Rome* (Cambridge 1996) 41–2, 52–6; Fox (1996) 143–54; J. K. Newman, *Augustan Propertius* (Zurich 1997) 265–75; Rambaux (2001) 277–80; DeBrohun (2003) 1–117; Coutelle (2005) 520–38.

1 'Whatever you can see here where vastest Rome is': the expansive gesture recalls phrases used of the whole visible world or heavens (Lucr. 1.542, Luc. 9.580, Pliny *NH* 2.1).

hospes: epigrams inscribed or quasi-inscribed on tombs, statues, dedications commonly address a stranger on what he sees (e.g. *IG* XI 4.1247.6 (3rd–2nd cent. BC), Alcaeus *AP* 9.588.1 (*HE* 106), *IG* XII 3.199.1). Here what he sees is not a specific object but everything in Rome. Even *SGO* 01/12/02 on Halicarnassus' past begins from a statue. 1–54 and book 4 as a whole are a huge non-inscribed epigram about Rome; *hoc* secondarily denotes the book itself, all taken up with Rome (cf. the more modest Cat. 1.8–9 *hoc libelli* | *qualecumque*). Literal dialogue with a tourist is also evoked, as with Aeneas himself in *Aeneid* 8 (*hospes* 188 etc.); but the absence of further reference to the *hospes* in the poem points primarily to epigram.

2 Phrygem shows Aeneas' country as well as city; it heightens the *hospes*' wonder.

collis et herba leads into 3–4; cf. Livy 5.53.9: there was nothing here but *silvas paludesque*, Ov. *F.* 5.93 *arbor* (generic like *collis*) *et herbae*, 639 *herbas*.

3–4 go beyond 3.9.49 and Tib. 2.5.25 (cattle grazing on the Palatine). Augustus, victor of Actium, inhabitant of the Palatine and born there, is implicitly set against the mere refugee Evander (cf. Ov. *AA* 3.119–20: Palatine *sub Phoeboducibusque*, 4.6 intro.). The technology of naval warfare and the recent temple is contrasted with the simplicity of herds; the cows' collapse is wittily opposed to *stant*. For *procumbo* of animals resting and of buildings see *TLL* s.v. 1568.22–33, 1569.10–26; for the permissible repetition *prō- prō-* cf. Ov. *Met.* 8.593–4 *inque profundum* | *propulit*. Against *concubere* (Ω) is the fem. *profugae*; it is not a likely corruption of *profugi*, which would have been thought gen. Looked at from later, 3–4 contrast 4.6 with 4.9, cf. 4.9.4 *statuit* (a neat twist) *fessos . . . boues*. Line 4 does not mention Evander's city Pallanteum, conveniently for line 2; cf. *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* (Rome 1984–91) II 441–3, III 930–1.

Nauali, used only here of Apollo, is an imitation of a cult-title.

5–6 Pottery statues of gods and the hut of Romulus often make points against present values (in 2.16.19–20 with cheek against Augustus). Here *opprobrio*, to the discredit of the present (cf. Livy 34.4.4 *antefixa fictilia . . . ridentes*, Pliny *NH* 35.157;

Ov. *F.* 1.205–6), is balanced with *sine arte* (cf. Call. *Aet. fr.* 100–1 Pfeiffer (progress in divine statues), contrast Pliny *NH* 35.158). *creuere* . . . *templa*, rather than *opes*.

5 'These golden temples [now] grew for gods who were of pottery [then].' 'From gods' is harder to make sense of. The gods are identified with but survive their statues (cf. 4.2.59–60), and one stage in time is superimposed on the other: cf. e.g. 4.10.11, Call. *Hy.* 1.21–7 (Arcadian rivers). *haec* is temporal, not just spatial (cf. e.g. Livy 7.25.9 *hae uires populi R.*), and general, not just the Capitol (cf. *creuere* and D.H. *Ant.* 4.61.4; contrast *aurea* of Capitol at Virg. *Aen.* 8.348). Palatine and Capitol boasted Romulus' hut (*LTUR* 1 241–2, add Virg. *Aen.* 8.654 for Capitol). An Iron Age hut had clearly remained on the Palatine (cf. D.H. *Ant.* 1.79.11), like the ones there of which evidence has been found: see C. Angelelli and S. Falzone, *JRA* 12 (1999) 5–32, *MAR* 83.

7 moves back. The Capitol is bare of even Romulus' temple of Jupiter Feretrius: this links to, and precedes, 4.4.1–2. The impressive line changes to hard rock the numinously shaggy Capitol of Virg. *Aen.* 8.347–54. The epic thunder is at least not the poet's (see 134n.).

8 The Tiber comes from Etruria (Virg. *Aen.* 8.473 etc.), hence 'foreign', as Ov. *F.* 3.524 *aduena Thybri. erat* (from 14?) produces a pointless sentence. The brilliant *murus erat* (Heyworth (1986) 208–9) does not hint at present greatness; and the Tiber did not encircle the city or impede pressing enemies. One line of thought might be *bubus iit* (Hutchinson): the Tiber, which then still covered the Velabrum (4.2.7–10), adjacent to the Forum Boarium, flowed merely to our cattle, not to that *nobile* . . . *forum* (4.9.19–20n.). Cf. *nuda* in 7 and *MAR* 132, 246 (P. will also think away the embankment wall). A stage before Romulus would be envisaged (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 12.24.1), with *nostris* superimposed from later. For the rusticity cf. line 4 above and 4.4.5–6; cattle, like Romulus' dwelling (6, 9–10), appear twice. For the form *iit* cf. e.g. Ov. *F.* 6.117; for dat. of motion e.g. P. 1.20.32 (Luc. 10.289 for 'flow' (*OLD* s.v. *eo* 3b) + construction); for perf. instead of imperf. e.g. 12, 16.

9 'Where this house of Remus [Romulus' hut] was once raised high by steps.' One would naturally refer *se sustulit* to the past, and connect it, not 10, with *olim*. Cf. Ov. *F.* 6.793–4 (temple) *quam Romulus olim . . . condidit*. The steps will be the *scalae Caci*, which probably led up to the area of Romulus' hut on the Palatine (cf. Solin. 1.18: the hut where Romulus lived was *ad supercilium scalarum Caci*; Plut. *Rom.* 20.5; Diod. 4.21.2). *Remi* can stand for both brothers, or Romulus (2.1.23 etc.). *se sustulit* exploits the use of *tollo* for building or raising high, cf. *OLD* s.v. *tollo* 7a, s.v. *extollo* 2a; but it presents the height from the Forum Boarium given by the pre-existing steps, not the height of the house in itself. Cf. Petr. 122.146–7 for the metonymy. The line may glance at the height in itself of Augustus' house, just on the other side of the *scalae Caci* (cf. Carettoni (1983) 7–16). *qua* ironically locates the *maxima regna* of 10 (contrast 1). *quo* (ΠΛ) . . . ! or *quot* . . . ! (Dieterich) fail to convince. *qua* does not favour a contrast with the *aedes Quirini* on the Quirinal (*ista, Remi* (sc. *domus*): W. S. Watt, *CQ* 25 (1975) 155–6). *nunc* . . . ; *olim* (Heyworth) would make that contrast more plausibly, though steps are standard for temples.

10 unus . . . focus and **fratrum** show that here the hut antedates Romulus' kingship (cf. Conon 48.36–8 Brown; Solin. 1.18).

11–14 The Romans themselves, and their political organization, come into view. *curia* is here used generally, and with some superimposition, of buildings made for meetings of the senate: now the Curia Iulia inaugurated by Octavian in 29 BC (R. J. A. Talbert, *The senate of Imperial Rome* (Princeton 1984) ch. 3 and figs. 2–7, *LTUR* 1.332–4, *MAR* 99; Ov. *AA* 3.117–18), originally the Curia Hostilia built by the king Tullus Hostilius (*LTUR* 1.331–2). *alta* emphasizes the building, *nitet* the building but also the purple decoration of curule magistrates' togas, opposed to the uncivilized skins of old (12, cf. Lucr. 5.1418–29, with an anti-modern twist; Thgn. 53–8: the antithesis of urban nobility; Virg. *Aen.* 8.460 (Evander)). The pentameter lets the hexameter down; but the narrator's lack of rusticity is shown by the neat | *pellitos . . . patres* |, answering *praetexto . . . senatu* |, and the elegantly inset *rustica corda* (4.9.3n.), which turns round Virg. *Aen.* 5.729 *fortissima corda* (select *iuuenes*). Farming senators are approved e.g. at Cic. *Sen.* 56.

13–14 look back to Romulus' institution of senate and *comitia curiata*. Cf. T. J. Cornell, *The beginnings of Rome* (London 1995) 114–18, 245–51; A. Lintott, *The constitution of the Roman Republic* (Oxford 1999) 49. *prati* is rural; the horn has rustic associations as well as military (*TLL* s.v. *bucina* 2231.64–2232.24). Within the picture, social division is implied: cf. D.H. *Ant.* 2.8.4 (senators called by name, not with trumpet). But these senators do not even have a *curia*. *in prati saepe*, if correct, mimics the probable fencing round of later Curiae, cf. 4.4.13, Cic. *Rep.* 2.31 (Tullus Hostilius) *fecit . . . et saepsit . . . comitum et curiam*. Virg. *Ecl.* 8.37 *saepibus in nostris* may be enough to justify *saepes* of the space not the hedge; certainly 'often' is pointless. Shackleton Bailey's *nempe*, with some irony, is possible. For the 100 senators cf. Livy 1.8.7 etc.; Augustus' senate was now, after cuts, about 600 (Dio 54.13–14, 18 BC). His concern with the senate makes the ancient topical (cf. e.g. Cl. Nicolet in F. Millar and E. Segal (edd.), *Caesar Augustus* (Oxford 1984) 89–96, 103–4).

15–16 The very senate met in the meadow (14); large audiences in purpose-built theatres offer a contrasting Rome. Cf. Varro *RR* 2 *pr.* 3: Romans now prefer attendance at theatres to agricultural toil. The theatre is a favourite pastime of the Propertian narrator (2.16.33–4, 22a.4–10, 4.8.77). Augustus rebuilt Pompey's theatre; his own new theatre, though not yet dedicated, was in use by 17 BC (*ILS* 5050.157–8; *LTUR* v 31–5, *MAR* 242). Before the 1st cent. BC, there were no permanent theatres in Rome, or awnings to shade audiences; for the latter, see 3.18.13, Lucr. 4.75–86, Ov. *AA* 1.103, Pliny *NH* 19.23. For saffron sprayed on to the stage-platform (*pulpita*) cf. Lucr. 2.416, Ov. *AA* 1.104, Pliny *NH* 21.33. Both hexameter and pentameter end with visibly Greek words, and suggest foreign culture and luxury. *sollemnes* 'customary' (*OLD* s.v. 2) indicates the limited perspective of the present.

17–18 return to the dominating theme of religion, via a sort of visual pun. The huge cloths hung on wooden constructions in large theatres are contrasted with

little objects representing people hung up from trees as part of rustic Italian *ludi*. In Virg. *G.* 2.385–9 (drawing on Varro?) these parallel the crude beginnings of Greek drama: to Bacchus *oscilla ex alta suspendunt mollia pinu*. Cf. further K. Meuli, *Gesammelte Schriften* (Basle 1975) 1 251–82. Trembling during worship would not really suit a traditionalist depiction of Roman religion; nor would *pendula* ‘in suspense’ have an obvious point of reference as in Hor. *Epist.* 1.18.110 *neu fluitem dubiae spe pendulus horae*.

externos quaerere diuos makes religious innovation sound like a strange extension of trade; cf. 3.5.11–12: we go to sea *et hostem | quaerimus*. It is treated in hostile fashion by Livy, cf. already 1.20.6, 4.30.9–11 . . . *ne qui nisi Romani di neu quo alio more quam patrio colerentur*, 8.11.1. The old-fashioned *fuit* (< *fueit*) is apt. Cf. *CIL* 1² p. 820, Leumann (1977) 607; P. 1.10.23, Hor. *C.* 1.3.36, Virg. *Aen.* 8.363.

19–22 How 19–20 attach to 17–18 is uncertain; Lachmann’s *at* (sc. *cura fuit*) does not seem too unlike 1.6.21–2. 19 provides another rustic custom, with leaping over fires of hay (cf. 4.4.73–8n.); this predates Rome. The city element in the *Parilia* (20) is naturally seen as later. In this urban part, the *populus* takes purificatory material from the altar of Vesta, including the blood of a horse (Ov. *F.* 4.731–4). P. uses this relative chronology to make a contrast between the newer prestigious *equo* | and the mere *asellis* | whose services once sufficed the same Vesta: garlanded, they bring bread at the *Vestalia* (Ov. *F.* 6.311, 469–70). Vesta’s worship too preceded Rome.

20 The horse was probably distinct from the horse killed in October (G. Dumézil, *Archaic Roman religion* (Chicago 1970) 1 215–28); it was perhaps a gelding (*OLD* s.v. *curtus* 1b). *nouantur*, lit. ‘renewed’, helps suggestions of modernity.

qualia (*lustra*) presents a grammatically loose relation, like a sort of *ita ut*; cf. 3.17.40.

21 What is here presented as a survival elsewhere appears as a corollary of the donkey’s present role in turning the flour-mill (Ov. *F.* 6.318, 470). For Vesta’s association with donkeys cf. *Copa* 26 *Vestae delictum est asinus*; painting in Pompeii VII 12.11 (baker’s shop), *PPM* VII 490–1. The phrasing also recalls Call. *Aet.* fr. 97.9–10 *Massimilla*: sacrifices of donkeys ‘delight’ Apollo.

22 macrae uilia: the adjs. are forcefully joined. Cattle for public sacrifice are expected to be *opimi* (Varro *RR* 2.1.20, cf. Sen. *HF* 922–3). Allusion to 2.10.24 *pauperibus sacris uilia tura damus*, on the poet’s present inability to praise Augustus well, may set his ambitions now against one aspect of his subject-matter, Rome’s mean beginnings. Call. *Aet.* fr. 1 *Massimilla* may add intricate play in 21–2. The narrator, who approves of Callimachus, not old poetry and the wrong sort of garland (61–4), could be thought aptly to disdain the donkeys whose braying Callimachus abhors (fr. 1.29–32), and the *thin* sacrifice contrary to Apollo’s wishes (fr. 1.24–5).

23 The victims are fattened here; but their size is contrasted with the small *compita*. The point is partly the smallness of the city when Servius Tullius instituted local cults based on junctions of streets (D.H. *Ant.* 4.14.3–4). Servius also

introduced a lustration of all the citizens (D.H. *Ant.* 4.22.1–2; cf. *Tab. Iguv.* VIIb 48–VIIa); but the small-scale lustration here contrasts with that in 20, and suggests links with lustration and Compitalia in the country (cf. 24). 2.22a.3 *nulla meis frustra lustrantur compita plantis* probably puns on the same practice. For pigs sacrificed to the Lares cf. (private) e.g. Tib. 1.10.25–6, Wissowa (1912) 411–12; (public) Ph. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale* (Paris 1970) 594–603.

24 calamos: mere reed-pipes, not the *tibia* (cf. 4.6.7–8). *pastor* may connect specifically with the *uicus compiti pastoris* in Regio XII of Rome (*CIL* VI 975b.47).

litabat 'offered' (*OLD* s.v. 3); cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 6.253–4 for offering inwards.

25–6 | *pastor* (24) leads on to *arator* |; *miles* follows (27). A hint at the sequence of Virgil's career prepares the later implicit comparison of the narrator's and Rome's development.

pellitus saetosa, effectively conjoined, pick up 12 and suggest a rustic hairiness; cf. 61. The origin of the Lupercalia is made to be crude country practice, not extreme Arcadian primitivism imported by Evander or the wild lives of Romulus and Remus' bands (cf. Livy 1.5.1–2, D.H. *Ant.* 1.80.1, Ov. *F.* 2.267–302, 359–80, [Aur. Vict.] *Orig.* 22.1; Cic. *Cacl.* 26 plays on theories of a primordial origin). Hints at these other views, and the ritual, bring out the unspectacular plainness of the present account: the *luperci Fabiani* (cf. *CIL* XI 3205.2, 1st cent. AD) were associated with Remus (Ov. *F.* 2.371–8, [Aur. Vict.] l.c.); *licens* 'uninhibited' recalls the *lasciua* of the *luperci* (Livy 1.5.2); *pellitus* contrasts with their more extreme loin-cloths; *arator* implicitly contrasts bulls with the people the *luperci* whipped. Augustus at some point regulated rather than revived the ritual; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 31.4.

The Lupercalia appeared in Butas' aetiological poem (*SH* 234).

27–8 The connection with 29 *galeritus* and with 25–6 suggests an emphasis on the wearing of arms, not simply the use of purpose-made weapons. *miles radiabat in armis* seems unlikely to refer to spear or sword alone: cf. e.g. *Il. Lat.* 283 *fulgens . . . in armis* (shield and spear), Sil. 8.466 *pictis radiabat in armis* (like a jewel). *nuda* denotes chiefly the absence of armour and shield; cf. e.g. Mart. 9.56.6 (spear but not armour or shield, in one sense of *nudus*). One might in any case expect a word more distinct from the past than *infestis* (say *aeratis* or *argenteis*). 28 draws on Virg. *Aen.* 7.523–7, where even in Aeneas' Italy rustic *sudibus* . . . *praeustis* give way to weapons and shining bronze. The burned stake links to the shaggy whip (25).

miscebant . . . proelia: see *OLD* s.v. *misceo* 13b.

29 The emphasis falls on *galeritus*: only a cap of skin, not a metal helmet. But 29 advances on 27–8: instead of the *rudis* . . . *miles*, a general with a special tent; instead of *proelia nuda*, some special headgear. Roman warfare and its evolution are a major theme of book 4; but the first steps are taken by the Etruscan ally of Romulus (4.2.49–54n.; *praetoria* also of Tatius, 4.4.31). P. appears to have made his name more foreign; cf. the Gk. place-name Lacmon (Hecat. *FGH Hist* 1 F 102(a) etc.). *Lyc-*, if sound, may suggest a connection with wolves (cf. *oues* 30); it also connects with the characters Lycotas and Lygdamus (4.3, 4.7, 4.8).

30 This couplet unites kings who fought each other (4.2.51–2) and combined forces to form the Roman people. It prepares for poem 2 and poem 4. Tatius' wealth, whether as Sabine king or joint king with Romulus, was largely in the country (cf. Tib. 2.1.67–8: Cupid born *inter agros interque armenta*). Etymological theories supported the belief that early Roman wealth was pastoral: cf. Cic. *Rep.* 2.16.2, Varro *LL* 5.92.

31–2 are problematic. *hinc* in 31 should refer to the derivation of Romulus' tribes, Tities from Tatius, Luceres from Lycmon (Romulus can be understood as the origin of Ramnes). Cf. Cic. *Rep.* 2.14.1, Varro *LL* 5.55. But *hinc* of Romulus' triumph in 32 must have a quite different meaning, all the more so as he first triumphed before the war with Tatius (D.H. *Ant.* 2.34 etc.). What meaning is unclear. White horses for a triumph are elsewhere an outrageous innovation by Camillus (Diod. 14.117.6, Livy 5.23.5, Plut. *Cam.* 7.1–2, Dio 52.13.3 etc.). This need not matter (even the chariot is controversial, Plut. *Rom.* 25.7–8); but it is hard to see how the magnificent horses fit into the argument of 1–38. *uir* and *Soloni* (of Solonium, cf. D.H. *Ant.* 2.37.2) do not produce an elegant line. Perhaps a learned addition (suspected by Hutchinson), which may have displaced a genuine couplet (lac. after 32 Müller). *quippe* 33, which should explain, ill follows either 32 or 30. (*nempe*, with a self-evident point, might be possible after 30.) *hinc* might have been inspired by 45.

33–6 Nearby towns, now entirely dwarfed by Rome, are exalted in their past state to make early Rome less significant. Fidenae was 8 km from Rome, Alba probably 18. Bovillae and Gabii were both 17 km from Rome; they appear together in Cic. *Planc.* 23 (tendentious) as places almost devoid of inhabitants. Cf. Hor. *Epist.* 1.11.7–8 *Gabii desertior atque | Fidenis*; Luc. 7.391–6 (Gabii and Alba deserted). The ruins at Gabii contrasted with the much more limited settlement in the 1st cent. BC and so encouraged exaggerated statements: cf. D.H. *Ant.* 4.53.1; L. Caretta *et al.*, *Gabii* (Rome 1978); M. Almagro-Gorbea (ed.), *El santuario de Juno en Gabii* (Rome 1982). Gabii had once been in particularly close association with Rome: cf. Varro *LL* 5.33 (distinct from other non-Roman territory). Its ancient treaty with Rome supposedly remained in Sancus' temple (D.H. *Ant.* 4.58.4, cf. Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.24–5; *RIC*² Aug. no. 411; C. J. Smith, *Early Rome and Latium* (Oxford 1996) 209–10; see also C. Gabrielli, *CQ* 53 (2003) 247–59). For Bovillae and Fidenae cf. G. M. De Rossi, *Bovillae* (Florence 1979), L. Quilici and St. Quilici Gigli, *Fidenae* (Rome 1986).

The kings of Alba and their deeds had been the subject of the narrator's epic song in 3.3.3–4. The destruction of Alba, under Tullus, was intimately bound up with the conflict of Rome and Fidenae (Livy 1.27–9; *steterat* 1.29.6); Fidenae was founded by Alba and made a Roman colony by Romulus (Virg. *Aen.* 6.773; D.H. *Ant.* 2.53.4). 35 and 36 should thus be kept together (33, 36, 35, 34 Müller), and 36 referred particularly to the time between Rome's foundation and Fidenae's first attack, occasioned in Livy 1.14.4 by Rome's excessive proximity.

33 Bovillae was less thought close to the City when that city was small. Cf. Flor. 1.5.7 *Tibur, nunc suburbanum*. For *minus* separated from *suburbanae* cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.3.142 *pruiatusque magis uiuam te rege beatus*.

34 Gabi: for the contraction cf. Man. 1.789 *Deci*, N–W 1 159–60, 189.

35 The etymological white sow adds further rusticity, especially in Virgil's version (*Aen.* 8.42–5, 47–8, 81–5). It appears on the Ara Pacis (west façade); its body was supposedly preserved (Varro *RR* 2.4.18). The birth of its piglets prescribed the date of Alba's 'birth' (Fab. Pict. 5(a) Chassignet, Varro *LL* 5.144).

36 longa . . . uia is the complement of *Fidenas isse*. *longa* may play on Alba Longa.

37–8 The section closes with a climactic separation from the past. *patrium* 'ancestral' looks to the early period in general, and especially to father Romulus (Enn. *Ann.* 105–9 Skutsch), who gave Rome its name (Varro *LL* 8.18, Livy 1.7.3 etc.). The prominence of animals in rustic life (cf. esp. 4, 30) is trumped by a more intimate connection, with a wilder creature. Cf. 2.6.20 *nutritus duro, Romule, lacte lupae*; the she-wolf is often deployed in a negative fashion (so Livy 3.66.4; Vell. 2.27.2, with Rome as her wood of refuge). For the legend, see O. Zwiernlein, *Lucubrations philologiae* (Berlin 2004) 11 155–203, and e.g. Ov. *F.* 2.413–22. *sanguinis altricem* adapts Cic. fr. 10.42 Courtney *siluestris . . . Romani nominis altrix*, of the statue of the wolf and twins on the Capitol (*LTUR* 11 248–9). The Roman is a strange subj. for *putet*, as if the idea were new to him; the sceptical *non putat* (5) would need expansion. Expected would be *quis* (Hutchinson): cf. Mart. 12.21.1–2 *quis . . . putet . . . ?* (of birth in Spain), Stat. *Silv.* 4.5.33–4 *quis non . . . putet?* (of birth in Rome); Ov. *Met.* 2.436 (L) for interrogative corrupted to negative.

39–40 move back beyond Romulus in time and away to Troy in space; the address sharpens the shift of focus. *misisti, Troia*, adds purpose to Aeneas' *feror exsul in altum | cum . . . Penatibus* (Virg. *Aen.* 3.11–12). *melius* goes with *huc*, and implies the better fortune enjoyed by the Penates in Rome; 1–38 make this a resounding understatement. Cf. *OLD* s.v. *melius* 7a 'with more favourable omens . . . or outcome'; Virg. *Aen.* 3.497–9, Hor. *C.* 4.6.23–4 *potiore ductos | alite muros* (than Troy's). 40 presents the point more emotionally; for *heu* without lament cf. e.g. 2.29b.30, Ov. *F.* 2.408. The couplet develops Tib. 2.5.61–2 *Troia quidem tunc se mirabitur et sibi dicet | uos bene tam longa consuluisse uia*.

For the Penates Publici brought from Troy, cf. *RRC* nos. 307, 312 (108–7 and 106 BC), the temple to them rebuilt by Augustus (D.H. *Ant.* 1.68.1, Aug. *RG* 19.2; *LTUR* IV 75–8, *MAR* 189) and their appearance in the scene of Aeneas' sacrifice on the Ara Pacis.

auē gestures to the importance of bird-omens in founding cities at Call. *Aet.* fr. 50.58–67 Massimilla, and also perhaps to epigrams on omens from birds: these form a section in Posidippus (21–35 A–B), including an omen for the poet's voyage to Egypt (i.e. Alexandria; 22 A–B).

41–4 move back (*iam . . . tunc*) into *Aeneid* 2 and still earlier omens. But they ignore the omens immediately before Aeneas' lifting of Anchises (Virg. *Aen.*

2.679–704). The archetypal act of religious and familial piety becomes the focus; *flammaeque recedunt* (Virg. *Aen.* 2.633) is moved to Aeneas' carrying of Anchises, as at Ov. *Ex P.* 1.1.33–4, Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.188–9. The plup. *laeserat* relates earlier events to that moment; *illos* (Schrader: *illam* Ω, from *puppis*) are the Penates Anchises carries (Virg. *Aen.* 2.717).

42 equi: another animal, as so often ending the line (cf. 20–4, 30, 32?, 38; 40); but this is a cunning contrivance (cf. *abiectus*), not a rustic beast. *uenter apertus* contains suggestions of childbirth, as often with the Wooden Horse: cf. e.g. Enn. *Trag.* 72–3 Jocelyn, Virg. *Aen.* 2.258, Triph. 386–90; Hor. *Saec.* 13 *aperire partus*. The real birth of the piglets portending Alba (35), and the maternity of the wolf creating Rome (38, 55–6), contrast with this destructive artifice. Cf. Hor. *C.* 4.6.13–20 for a related contrast.

43–4 pater . . . nati: a true parent follows. The scene is crucial for the Julian line (42, 46): cf. *RRC* nos. 458, 494/3a and b, Ov. *F.* 5.563–4 (in the Forum Augustum), A. Erskine, *Troy between Greece and Rome* (Oxford 2001) 17–23; more generally see *LLMC* 11.386–90. However, the expected relation of parent and child is neatly altered, with the parent carried and afraid; contrast e.g. Sen. *Tro.* 792–3. Aeneas' (altruistic) fear in the Virgilian scene (*Aen.* 2.728–9, 735–6) is removed from him to Anchises and, with extravagant fantasy, to the flames. Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 2.633 (41–4n.); Man. 4.24 (but for fate) *fugissent ignes Aenean . . . ?*, Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.189. Aeneas is seen from outside, with admiration, not from within, as emotional first-person narrator. *umeros . . . pios* uses the Virgilian narrator's *manibusque piis* (Virg. *Aen.* 4.517, cf. 3.42 (Polydorus speaking)). The scene is distorted later in the book: Cynthia with the narrator (7.17–18 *pependi, in tua colla*), the girls of Lanuvium (8.13 *redeunt in colla parentum*).

45–8 tunc . . . uenere in 45 gives a bald and slight historical summary, not properly integrated into the argument about Troy; Heinsius' *hinc* is an improvement. *hinc* makes the heroes' figurative coming from Troy part of Aeneas' literal coming; *uenere* alone would not suffice for *tunc* to mean 'when Aeneas left Troy'. 46–7 have a similar point: in carrying Aeneas' arms (47), Venus was figuratively carrying Augustus' (46). In the background is Venus' bringing of arms to Aeneas on land, including a shield that depicts the rise of Rome and the victory of Augustus (Virg. *Aen.* 8.608–14); but 48 suggests that the primary reference is to Aeneas' voyage. An image of his mother, like Vesta, is readily supposed among his *magnis dis* (Virg. *Aen.* 3.12). These deities, as if in charge, transport the arms on the ship, as in Virg. *Aen.* 1.68 Aeneas does the gods (*portans . . . Penates*); the inversion is felt, cf. *cepit . . . deos* 48. Hollis's clever *uenit* (*ap.* Heyworth) follows (*hinc*) *uenere* rather awkwardly in chronology; the same *arma* have to be, without explanation, both Aeneas' and Augustus'; the genitive with *arma* in both members of the epanalepsis (*arma . . . , arma . . .*) would produce too great a similarity between those members for this figure (see Wills (1996) 159–61). The enjambement, though not pointed, would be drastic (in Tib. 2.2.18, 2.5.30 the clause is not incomplete). Transposition of

47–8 before 41–2 (Marr (1970) 161–2) would unattractively split *sui Caesaris* from *Iule* (cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 1.286–8, Ov. *F.* 4.123–4, Vell. 2.41.1).

45 animi: pl. for sing., as e.g. 3.15.5, 4.7.11; Cic. *Off.* 1.61 praises the *animus* of the Decii. *Deci* is probably *cos.* 340, who gave his life in battle by *deuotio*: cf. 3.11.62, Cic. *Fin.* 2.61; Oakley on Livy 8.19–11.1. Brutus was the first consul; the narrator resists the ambivalence of Virg. *Aen.* 6.819–23 on his consular and son-killing axes.

47 contrasts with Venus' hopeless engagement in war for the doomed Troy: cf. Hom. *Il.* 5.330–51, 426–30, Ov. *F.* 4.119–20. Virg. *Aen.* 1.206 *illic fas regna resurgere Troiae* shortly precedes the reassurance of Venus on this question (cf. 238–9).

49–54 The sentence structure here, as in 45–54 generally, runs over the couplets, grandly capturing the temporal sweep. Both conditions are presupposed to be true. 51–2 presuppose the truth of a prophecy, cf. Soph. *Aj.* 746 (if Calchas prophesies with sense), Virg. *Aen.* 3.433–4 (if Helenus prophesies truly). 49–50 presuppose that the killing of Remus, which happened, fulfilled a prophecy which said that the prosperity of the land of Rome (48) depended on it. Cf. 3.9.50 *caeso moenia firma Remo* (cf. Flor. 1.1.8), 4.6.43–4 (importance of initial ritual); Dio fr. 47 + fr. 50.1 Boissonade, 1183 (Sibylline prophecy, 228–226 BC, makes Rome's survival depend on human sacrifice). Cf. also T. P. Wiseman, *Remus* (Cambridge 1995) 117–25. The conditional in fact underlines the existence of other versions, including Hor. *Epod.* 7.17–20, where the killing causes Rome's woes. The condition would not follow well on 46. The two prophetesses, beginning the book's female speakers, are an allusion to Tib. 2.5.15–66 (cf. esp. 23–4) and to P. 3.13.61–6. P.'s Sibyl, probably unlike Tibullus', is put at Lake Avernus (Cumae), like Virgil's ecstatic Sibyl (*Aen.* 6.42–52, 77–102, cf. *tremulae*). In P. 3.13 Cassandra is linked to the narrator, who is prophesying Rome's downfall. Negativity is visibly excluded now.

49–50 Auernalis . . . Auentino perhaps stresses the distance of the Sibyl then. Augustus had moved her books to his Palatine, perhaps recently (Tib. 2.5.1, 17–18; J. Gagé, *Apollon romain* (Paris 1955) 542–55). The Palatine was also Romulus' hill in the rival augury (4.6.43–4n.); the Sibyl condemns Remus, on the wrong hill. *cortina* 'tripod' alludes to present cult: cf. Kleywegt on Val. Fl. 1.5–7a.

pianda: a sort of lustration, cf. *CIL* VI 32328.16, 20 (204 AD); *Tab. Iguv.* VIa 25–34 etc., where *piha-* is used of purifying produce and city by sacrifice.

51–4 The scene, as in 3.13.63–4, is Cassandra's prophecy as the wooden horse enters Troy. Cf. Apollod. *Epit.* 15.6 (from *Iliupersis?*), Virg. *Aen.* 2.246–7; paintings, Pompeii I 10.4, VII 6.38 (Naples inv. H 1326), *PPM* II 280–1 (cf. 276–9), VII 214 (both 1st cent. AD; in both cases Cassandra's rape and Priam's death are indicated, as Cassandra's rape is at 117–18 below); Q.S. 12.525–85, Tryph. 358–443. Less closely fitting 53–4 would be earlier prophecies, reported to Priam as in Lycophron; on this basis Heyworth suggests *lata* for *uera*, thus giving *ad* a verb and removing the duplication *rata . . . uera. uera*, however, seems desirable (cf. 49–54n.). If it is read, *ad* gives the recipient of *carmina* (cf. *OLD* s.v. *ad* 27a–b, Ov. *Ex P.* 3.2.91 *ad fratrem mandata*), though 53–4 formally address the Greeks.

In *sero rata* the emphasis is on *sero* (in usual versions fulfilment is swift), and the presupposed truth of *uera* probably makes the pre-empting in *rata* acceptable. Priam as target (cf. *parenti* 3.13.65) stresses the contrast with Aeneas' line (cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 2.554–63; Bassus *AP* 9.236 (*GP* 1611–16)); *caput*, formally a periphrasis, hints at his grim end, Virg. *Aen.* 2.557–8.

More usually, Cassandra tells the Trojans of the Greek plan; here she implies but reverses such a message with a striking address to the Greeks on their ultimate defeat (*male* is virtually neg., cf. e.g. Ov. *Her.* 2.104 *nobis qui male fauit amor*). Cf. Cassandra at Eur. *Tro.* 365–405, Lyc. [1226–80]. *uertile equum* makes the Greeks the real movers, but plays with turning round actual horses in true or apparent flight (Hor. *C.* 1.19.11 *uersis* . . . *equis*, Livy 37.43.6, 40.31.5). The first three verbs are significantly joined by alliteration; the first two clauses are animated by brevity. *huic cineri* is drastically proleptic, and paradoxical with *arma dabit*. Cf. e.g. Ov. *F.* 1.523–6 (Trojan ruins and ash win and rule), Man. 1.511–12 (Trojan ash warmed into empire, Greece conquered).

55–6 The continuity with Romulus as with Troy is now stressed. The wolf again contrasts with the destructive wooden horse (53). It rises to quasi-human status, is addressed, and shares the warm commemoration nurses often receive: cf. e.g. Call. *Ep.* 50 Pfeiffer, *CIL* VI 35037 and, with address to the nurses of Aeneas and Romulus and so of the Romans, Virg. *Aen.* 7.1 (opening position meaningful), Ov. *F.* 3.55. The growth is transferred from the human children (cf. Ov. *F.* 3.53 *lacte* . . . *creuisse ferino*; SGO 08/01/29.3) to *rebus* and *moenia*; the juxtaposition *moenia lacte* intensifies the strangeness. The walls are enlarged under Romulus and later kings (Livy 1.8.4, 38.6, 44.3–5).

Martia, often of wolves, here suggests the purpose of the divine father (so at Cic. fr. 10.43 Courtney, Livy 10.27.9), the paradoxical fierceness of such a *nutrix* (so at Man. 4.26) and the dependence of Rome's growth on arms (cf. 54 *Iuppiter arma dabit*).

57–8 The narrator at last steals gingerly on to his plan. 'For' relates to his making the statement in 55–6, and especially speaking of *moenia*; cf. e.g. Ov. *F.* 3.11 *Silvia Vestalis* (*quid enim uetat inde moueri?*), Stat. *Sib.* 5.5.1–3 *me miserum!* for I will not begin with usual words. *disponere* does not merely denote literary structuring or transfer to the poet the action he describes (cf. e.g. Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.36–7; Call. *Aet.* fr. 50.64–5 Massimilla for laying out cities). The poet is another Aeneas (*pio* . . . *uersu*, cf. 44 *umeros* . . . *pios*), founding the imitation Rome of his book. *uersu* (cf. *OLD* s.v. 2a 'furrow') plays on founders using ploughs (Varro *LL* 5.143, Virg. *Aen.* 5.755, D.H. *Ant.* 1.88.2, Man. 4.555–6). In the *Aeneid*, imitative building happens *within* the narrative (e.g. 3.349–51); relevant to P. is the imitation in the *Republic*, and the speakers' 'founding' of an imaginary city (e.g. 378e7–379a1, 443b7–c2). The narrator's small voice ill suits the grown walls, now themselves too small for Rome (D.H. *Ant.* 4.12.3–5). Cf. e.g. 3.3.5 *parua* . . . *ora* unsuited to epic, Ov. *Am.* 3.1.64 *magnus* . . . *sonus* (tragedy). Call. fr. 1.29–36 Massimilla, by contrast, decries loud noise.

59–60 reverse and push to the point of strangeness Lucr. 1.412–13 *usque adeo largos haustus e fontibus magnis | lingua . . . diti de pectore fundet*. The poet drinks from a small *riuus* (cf. 3.3.5, 15, 51–2; Ov. *Ex P.* 2.5.21–2 for *riuus*); but his song is also like a small spring: cf. Call. *Hy.* 2.105–12, praising not depreciating smallness. *exiguus* points to P.'s past self-presentation (2.1.72, 13.33, 3.9.36) and to elegy, unsuited to grand themes (Hor. *AP* 77 *exiguus elegos*, cf. *ibid.* 73–4; Ov. *F.* 6.22); but now the limits are crossed.

quodcumque recalls 1 *hoc quodcumque uides*, and so underlines here the disparity of poetry and subject. For the gen. with *quodcumque* cf. e.g. Ov. *F.* 2.579 (*uini*).

patriae recalls 3.13.59–66 (only there is P.'s *patria* Rome): Cassandra and the narrator are there joined in service to a *patria*. For the devoted *seruiet* cf. e.g. Cic. *Man.* 41.

61–2 With an abrupt jussive subj., the narrator becomes more confident. 58–60 have already shown the retention of the elegiac manner, despite the link with 3.3.1–16; there treating Rome's history went with drinking from the same large stream as Ennius. Now Ennius' manner is scorned; *Callimachi* | 64 contrasts with | *Ennius* 61. The line of thought connects with the rusticity of early Rome in 1–38: hairiness is characteristic of the archaic and the countrified, cf. e.g. Cic. *Cael.* 33, Ov. *Am.* 3.10.7, *AA* 1.108 *qualibet hirsutas fronde tegente comas* (time of Romulus), Mart. 7.58.7–8. Literary history follows suit: cf. Ov. *Tr.* 2.259 (hairy *Annales*), and e.g. Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.156–60. Rusticity and ivy garlands are opposed at P. 2.5.25–6; a Bacchic garland goes with worthwhile poetry at 2.30.37–40. At Lucr. 1.117–19, Ennius' garland marks successful Romanization of Greek poetry, which Lucretius will follow (with a new sort of garland, 928–30). Cf. S. Hinds, *Allusion and intertext* (Cambridge 1998) 53, 66, 73–4.

63–4 The boastfulness increases. 59–66 somewhat parody Hor. *C.* 3.30: fame in the place of birth is juxtaposed with Rome, a god is asked for a garland (cf. also *cingat* 61 with Hor. *C.* 3.30.16), the Latinization of the model is stressed. Cf. also Hor. *C.* 3.30.8–9 *Capitolium | scandet* (P. 4.1.65), 14 *superbiam*. *C.* 3.30 ends a series of books; P. 4.1.59–66, like 3.2.19–26, come in the prelude of a 'final' book and will be punctured. P., as fits the plural *libris*, had already claimed to be the Roman equivalent of the foremost Greek elegist(s) (3.1.1–6, 3.51–2; for the stress on genre cf. 2.34.31–2, 3.9.43–4, Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.91, 99–101). But going back to aetiology brings him closer. The narrator sounds un-Callimachean, however: not only does *tumefacta* hint at the fat, swollen poetry Callimachus opposed (fr. 1.23–4 Massimilla, cf. P. 2.34.32; Cat. 95.10), but Callimachus avoids such tones of exultant boasting (contrast even *Ep.* 21 Pfeiffer).

patria: *patriae* in 60 is Rome. A Roman citizen born elsewhere can have two *patriae*: cf. Cic. *Leg.* 2.1–6, with Dyck on 5, and e.g. Ov. *Tr.* 4.2.64, 10.3. But the collocation *Vmbria Romani* confirms the paradox, and the renunciation of earlier resentments (1.21–2, 2.1.29).

65–6 seem likely to refer to Umbria, not Rome (as F. H. Sandbach, *CQ* 12 (1962) 272). Umbria the place has been stressed in 63–4; *Roma, faue: tibi* (emphatic) 67 looks like turning to a new place. ‘The hills of Rome climbing from the valleys’ would seem tautologous, Umbrian citadels climbing from valleys strange. Rather, to one looking at them *de uallibus* (cernet; cf. e.g. *Ov. Am.* 2.11.43 *aspiciam . . . de litore*), the citadels on the Umbrian hills seem to climb (cf. *Virg. Aen.* 1.448 *gradibus surgebant limina*). For the walls and location of Umbrian cities, most often on hills, cf. P. Fontaine, *Cités et enceintes de l’Ombrie antique* (Brussels 1990). *uallibus* and *arces*, though either could be a poetic pl. (cf. e.g. 3.9.39, *Ov. F.* 2.392), together suggest the cities of Umbria rather than just Assisi (125n.). The viewer is to gauge their size from the greatness of the narrator’s poetry: this, not the physical city, now becomes primary (contrast 56). Ovid makes the viewer of Sulmo’s small walls think them great because of him (*Am.* 3.15.11–14): he, reversing P.’s reversal of Horace, returns to undeflated pride in closing a series of books.

67–8 Roma, near the intended end of the narrator’s poem, links with 1 (no *Roma* comes between), and also with *Troia* voc. at 39. But his *opus* is at its beginning, unlike Rome; the forward-looking *omina* and *avis* match those when Troy was ending, Rome not yet begun (40–1). The book is also an imitation Rome; 67–8 chime with D.H. *Ant.* 1.88, Romulus’ foundation. With *opus* cf. 1.88.2: he set the people to work, τοῖς ἔργοις (*Ov. F.* 4.830 *hoc mihi* (Romulus) *surgat opus*); with *avis* cf. 1.88.1: he took favourable omens, lit. birds, ὀρνίθων. (*candida* is ‘favourable’ (*OLD* s.v. 7a); the people’s *omina* are silence, cf. *Acc.* 15–16 Dangel.) The real Rome itself takes the place of the deities whose favour Romulus seeks: cf. D.H. *Ant.* 1.88.1; *Tib.* 2.5.1 *Phoebe, faue*.

69–70 Ends and beginnings intertwine. The announcement ends rather than beginning the intended prologue; contrast e.g. *Virg. G.* 1.5 *hinc canere incipiam*, 2.2 *nunc te, Bacche, canam*, *Aen.* 1.1 *arma uirumque cano*, *Grat.* 1 *dona cano diuum*. It does begin the proposed book (cf. *inceptis* 68). 70, closural in mentioning closure, looks to the purposed end of the book, cf. *Il. Lat.* 1066 *metamque . . . Homeri*; *Virg. G.* 2.541–2. The horse is now metapoetic: contrast 20 etc. *oportet* ‘must’ (both ‘should’ and ‘is bound to’) sets up H.’s attack.

deosque (K. Wellesley, *Act. Class. Debr.* 5 (1969) 96) might be right. But prologues can deceive (so 3.3.47–50 or *Hor. Sat.* 2.1); and this one is immediately reversed. ‘Ancient place-names’ (cf. *Luc.* 3.188) applies only to 4.4 and 9.16–20, as *dies* strictly only to 4.4.47, 73, 76–8, 6.69–86?, 8.3–14 (Lanuvium; play on days at 5.33–6). But *sacra diesque*, taking up 19–22, 25–6, would suggest a work by a *Romanus Callimachus* on ritual; the idea of festal days would be intensified at Rome (cf. *Call. fr.* 89.1–4 Massimilla, and e.g. *Livy* 5.52.2 *sacrificiis sollemnibus non magis dies statim quam loca sunt*, *II* XIII 2.110–113). One strand in the book is conveyed, with exaggerated austerity.

71–2 If H. attacks the narrator’s plans, he should not be equated with the formulaic *hospes* of epigram addressed in 1; he should first obtrude on the narrator

now, as if in reaction to 67–70. Unlooked-for speech best suits the objector to poetic plans (so Apollo in 3.3.13–16 or Virg. *Ecl.* 6.3–5), and best suits *quo ruis*: most instances initiate communication (so Virg. *Aen.* 12.312, Pers. 5.143, Sil. 12.703). The phrase follows on well from *suadet* 70. *dicere fata* must relate to the announcement of plans and the new direction revealed. The words turn the announcement into H.'s own terms, with a view to its defeat. 73–4 and 119–50 will elucidate the relation to the narrator's career; the portrayal of the work as a city being founded adds to the weight of the narrator's proclamation. (Romulus, and even Rome on the basis of its foundation, could be subjected to astrology and augury: Cic. *Div.* 2.98 (*fata canere*), Plut. *Rom.* 12.3–6; Varro *ap.* Cens. 17.15.) Further definition would be provided by *tua* (Sandbach), or by *noua* (Hutchinson) 'new destiny' cf. e.g. Ov. *Met.* 2.648, Val. Fl. 1.114, Stat. *Theb.* 9.211. *imprudens* 'ignorant of how to' would govern an inf., cf. 76, Hor. *Epod.* 17.47–8 (*prudens*); a more general ignorance (of prediction) is implied in the specific ignorance, as in e.g. Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.109 *nescius uti* | *compositis* (his hoard). The 'unfavourable' spinning would relate to the narrator's lot, generally or now (cf. 120; *condita* may play on poet and founder, and *fila* on composition, cf. e.g. 2.1.14, Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.225). *discere* (S) would need at least an adversative at 75.

73–4 strongly indicate that poetry is in question. If we granted Apollo's prophecies could be applied to astrology, his lyre is still associated with singing, not prophecy, even about a poet. 74 neatly fits 133 *pauca suo de carmine dictat Apollo*, cf. 1.2.27 *cum tibi . . . Phoebus sua carmina donet*, | *Aoniamque libens Calliopea lyram canam* (69) is taken up in *accersis lacrimas cantans* (Baehrens, but hardly a change) 'if you sing, you ask for tears' (*OLD* s.v. *arcesso* 5a). The participle is conditional, cf. e.g. Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.135 *hoc faciens uiuam melius*, K–S I 776; the present is vivid, cf. e.g. P. 4.5.37–8 *scribe . . . has artes si pauet ille, tenes*, K–S I 119–20. If it were objected that *arcessis* should be at the same time as *poscis*, one could read (Hutchinson) *arcesses . . . cantans* or *lacrimas: cantes*, (conditional). *canto*, unlike *cano*, is not used of prophecies, as in Sandbach's much more drastic *auersus cantat*.

pigenda 'which would have to be regretted'; cf. Ov. *Her.* 7.110.

75–6 It becomes clear the speaker is not Apollo. The initial assertion about the narrator's plans will be elaborately proved. The emphasis on certainty and method mark a quite different approach from the narrator's speech. H. is a very different sort of *uates*, cf. 71, and 51 *carmina uatis* of Cassandra, who is linked with the narrator: *uates* in Augustan poetry plays constantly on the relation of poet, prophet and truth, cf. e.g. 2.17.3 *horum ego sum uates* (cf. 3.8.17), Hor. *C.* 2.20.3 (in prophecy on self), Ov. *Met.* 15.879 *si quid habent ueri uatum praesagia. certis auctoribus* occurs often in prose for sure sources, e.g. Cic. *Ver.* 5.103, Caes. *Civ.* 2.18.3; here, especially Apollo and the narrator (122, 133–4). Strikingly, after *uates*, purely technical knowledge is the key, not inspiration. *nescius* pointedly reapplies the $\nu\eta\iota\delta\epsilon\iota$ c 'ignorant' used on the critics of *poetry* in Call. fr. 1.2 Massimilla, also at the start of the pentameter. For possibilities on the nature of H.'s sphere cf.

O. Neugebauer, *A history of ancient mathematical astronomy* (Berlin 1975) II 870–2; Montanari Caldini (1981) 21–2.

77–8 The announcement of H.'s name, marked out at the start of the pentameter, better suits a sudden appearance than a conversation already begun, whether with H. as *hospes* or as consulted astrologer. His ancestry shows him not Roman (or Italian); it is a foreign and parodic counterpart to Cornelia's lineage in 4.11. For Babylon and astrology cf. Lucr. 5.727–8, B. Bakhouché, *L'astrologie à Rome* (Leuven 2002) 5–12, 24–5; a Greek ending is retained for the Egyptian name *Horos* (SEG 24.1193.5 (3rd cent. BC) etc.), cf. *Horus as cognomen CIL* IV 3340.48.19 (p. 345), *al.* But respect is exacted on the narrator's own poetic principles: the astronomer and mathematician Conon is lauded at Call. *Aet.* fr. 110.1, 7–8 Pfeiffer (Cat. 66.1–10). Virg. *Ecl.* 3.40 further shows his celebrity. Despite a premature death (Archim. *Spir.* pr. p. 2 Heiberg etc.), he has evidently founded an astrological dynasty. H.'s inevitable career contrasts with the narrator's deviations (cf. 133–4). Archytas echoes the name of the earlier mathematician (cf. fr. B1 D–K p. 432 on astronomy; Hor. *C.* 1.28.5–6; herm-base Vat. inv. 316, from Tivoli, G. M. A. Richter, *The portraits of the Greeks* (London 1965) II 179, fig. 1021). *Horops* (not found elsewhere) and *Horos* toy with *horoscopus*.

79–80 in isolation have a challengingly Roman ring (cf. 4.11.41–2); *degenerasse* is to 'dishonour' the clan, cf. *OLD* s.v. 7. But the gods are in astrological form; they bear witness through the accuracy of H.'s predictions. *meis* contrasts H.'s *libris* with the narrator's (63), as well as other astrologers'. *fidē* makes unkind play with *fidē* 'lyre', the Lyre (cf. 74; Cic. *Arat.* 42 Soubiran etc. *Fides*; Man. 5.324–38 Lyre produces singers): truth rather than aestheticism matters to H. *fides* is driven home argumentatively in what follows (92, 98, 108); it is in fact an important theme of this *liber* (4.3.11, 46, 4.87, 5.27, 6.57, 60, 7.53).

81–8 present a series lacking in connection (cf. e.g. C. Becker, *WS* 79 (1966) 442–51). *nunc* (in Π) 81 makes no clear contrast (*propinquos* in 79 are not 'ancestors'), nor is there a ready substitute. *signa* 82 cannot be related to what precedes without unconvincing changes. 82–6 produce an awkward sequence. *signa* 82 suggests the constellations of the zodiac, as repeatedly manipulated on an instrument (*iterata* can hardly convey the 'often repeated' visits of the sun; cf. rather *TLL* s.v. *itero* 550.29–63 and e.g. Stat. *Ach.* 1.909 *quotiens iterabitur ensis!*). The zodiac, round the ecliptic (represented in the instrument of Ptol. *Synt.* 5.1), is oblique to the equator; cf. *obliquus* . . . *signorum* . . . *ordo* Virg. *G.* 1.239, Firm. *Math.* 1.10.5 etc. To these constellations (*signa*) the planets of 83–4 can hardly be in apposition. One could imagine *signa* and 83–6 all in parallel, dependent on one lost verb (cf. Heyworth); but the change in 85–6 from the accusatives to reported questions and back to the zodiac would make one further inconcinnity. 87–8 are palpably out of place; they are likely to be spurious, and to have come from the margin. 83–4, on benefic and malefic planets (e.g. S.E. *Math.* 5.29), might seem to lack P.'s usual inventiveness; *in omne caput* of Saturn alone seems pointless, and *felix* obvious (cf. e.g. Serv. Auct.

Aen. 2.690: in astrology Jupiter makes *felix*). A prolonged boast of knowledge, or complaint of ignorance, might appear a futile delay of the argument on *fides* (80, 89–108). Making *dicam* 87 govern what precedes would completely disrupt the train of thought. 81–8 are still less welcome when transposed elsewhere. Various involved accounts of the state of this passage could be entertained. In view of 87–8, a simpler possibility might be the insertion, encouraged partly by astrology, of varied matter quoted in the margins, i.e. originally in a commentary.

81 pretium fecere deos ‘have made the gods into pay’; *deis* (Lütjohann) would be easier. It would be implied that H. does not charge.

fallitur auro ‘is cheated for gold’, cf. e.g. Hor. *C.* 2.8.9–12, where *fallo* is used of gods sworn by. If *nunc* . . . *Iuppiter* were not part of the original text, *di mihi sunt testes* 79 could have provided an impetus for adduction.

82 rotae: cf. Man. 1.282 *rotat cursūs* (sphere of fixed stars, there actual).

83 felicitis (Kidd): a poetic pl. would seem confusing here.

86 Capricorn, keen on its immersion in water (Germ. *Arat.* 286–7), may be especially so with the water it rules: cf. Hor. *C.* 2.17.19–20 *tyrannus* | *Hesperiae Capricornus undae*, Man. 4.791–3 with Housman ad loc.; Montanari Caldini (1981) 26–7.

[87–8], alien from the context, must have been in the margin, so were either omitted or absent from the original text. A quotation seems most likely. 88 can only be made to fit the poem by drastic alteration (e.g. *regna superba* Housman, cf. Lyc. [1229–30]). As it stands it seems to refer, impressively, to the end of the cosmos, *longa* because outlasting real *sepulcra*. (Perhaps this end is even eternal, as on an Epicurean view; cf. e.g. *CIL* 1² 1732.7 (1st cent. BC) *longum* . . . *per aeuum* ‘for ever’.) Cf. Lucr. 5.91–8, 373–5 (death for earth, sea, sky), Luc. 7.812–15 (*rogus* for cosmos; land and sea to burn), Man. 4.837 (on Phaethon) *uno timuit condi natura sepulcro*. The pair of poetic plans in 87–8 is linked by extreme change; cf. e.g. Man. 1.511–12 (51–4n.) in context. 87 may be inspired by Ov. *F.* 1.523 *euersaque, Troia, resurges*; the occurrence of ash and of *urite* (cf. *uertile* 53) in *F.* 1.525–6 hardly proves that Ovid read 87, 88, 53, 54. If 87–8 are with that order voiced by Cassandra, *dicam*, which should be parallel to *canam*, is implausible; if by the narrator, the necessary removal of 53–4 from Cassandra is unwelcome. Cf. Marr (1970) 162–3, Murgia (1989).

89–104 H. now makes a short move back in time: he establishes the truth of present predictions through past predictions fulfilled. Cf. e.g. Cic. *Fam.* 6.6.7, Livy 25.12.2–11. His contrasting stories both concentrate on women (cf. the female victims at 111–12, 117–18); both have epigrammatic connections. Cf. Honest. *AP* 9.292 (*GP* 2428–31; woman loses two sons); Posid. 28 A–B (prediction on war). 89–98 bring us into the warfare of the present (contrast 27–9). Whether or not the characters are real, the Arrii had risen remarkably in status and wealth earlier in the century (*RE* II 1251–4, *MRR* III 25); *auarae* (97) may have a point.

89–90 The structure makes it seem at first that *produceret* refers to birth, an apt time for prediction, or to upbringing; for birth cf. Pers. 6.18–19, Sil. 1.111–12,

for upbringing see *OLD* s.v. 4. In fact it refers to bringing the sons from the house to go to war, cf. *Ov. Her.* 13.139–44 . . . *arma dabit . . . producetque uirum . . .* This makes it less remarkable that H. should predict death in battle (contrast the vast intervals in 49–52, *sero rata* 51). While these twins do suffer the same fate, *geminos* hints at a well-known problem for astrologers (*Diog. Bab.* fr. 36 *SVF* III pp. 217–18 etc.).

uetante deo: divine disapproval on a matter of life and death, and real *arma*; contrast 73–4, *uetat* 134, *Hor. C.* 1.6.10 *imbellisque lyrae Musa potens uetat* (war-poetry declined).

91 patrios . . . Penates, though domestic, make a link with 39. The situation looks back too to earlier elegy, especially *Tib.* 1.3.33 (the narrator ill on campaign) *mihi contingat patrios celebrare Penates*. Cf. also e.g. *Cic. Prov.* 35 (Caesar) *si in patriam, si ad deos Penates . . . redire properaret*. Romans now fight abroad (*auarae* 97 denotes a desire for foreign riches); the near-epigram 89–98 prepares the extended 4.3, again seen from a woman's perspective.

92 After a structure of three lines, the pentameter briskly presents the proof. The events themselves are deferred for 93–6. At this stage H. appears more interested in his prediction.

93–4 *Lupercus*, while a common *cognomen* (e.g. *CIL* VI 22662.2), recalls the ancient ritual (26). The wounding of his horse causes both his touching concern and the horse's fall; cf. *Livy* 31.37.9 *ruente saucio equo praeceps ad terram datus. sibi* is emphatic, cf. e.g. *Livy* 7.41.2 *sibi se priuatim nihil cauere; . . . militibus cauendum*, *Phaed.* 1.9.1; it is further stressed by the sympathetic *heu. non bene cauit* suggests he did not avoid the horse's weight, cf. *Livy* 39.49.3 (with *prolapso equo*). For the *puer's* (97) attitude to the horse compare, at an extreme, the boyish *Parthenopaeus*, *Stat. Theb.* 9.878–9. The initial unclarity of *prolapso* (abl.) is resolved by the end of the line, cf. 1.8b.35 *sibi dotatae* (gen.). Fall from a horse in war and (supposed) death appears in the astrologically illustrative life at *Vett. Val.* 7.5.9 *Pingree*. *Lupercus'* horse is all too actual: cf. 70.

95–6 *Gallus*, a still more common *cognomen*, contrasts in his death with earlier *Propertian Galli* (1.10.5 ('death' in love), 1.21 (relation, killed after fighting *Octavian*), 2.34.91–2 (the elegist); book 1 plays with *Galli*). His falling *in front of* the eagle-standard suggests that he is not the *aquilifer* of the legion but the *primipilus* or senior centurion, who bears responsibility for the *aquila* (cf. e.g. *Juv.* 14.197–8; *credita* suggests *signa* is poetic pl., cf. *Ov. AA* 3.528). See B. Dobson, *Die Primipilares* (Bonn 1978). A new soldier would not start with such a post, even if already an *eques* (cf. S. Demougin, *L'ordre équestre sous les Julio-Claudiens* (Rome 1988) 376–7); P.'s story may not be wholly realistic. Fighting in the camp to defend the eagle suggests a serious defeat; readers would think of *Lollius'* defeat by the *Sugambri* and others in 16 BC, when *legio V* lost its eagle (*Vell.* 2.97.1, mentioning *Lollius'* greed; *Dio* 54.20.4 ambush of cavalry). See A. von Domaszewski, *Zeitgeschichte bei römischen Elegikern* (SBHA 1919.2) 6–8. This defeat is redressed later in the book by *Augustus* (6.77). The metal bird, with this role, indicates the modern

(post-Marian) Roman army; the *rostra cruenta* contrast ironically with the beak of a real eagle, bloodied by its prey.

Gallus at: cf. 1.6.22, 4.10.23 *Cossus at*, Virg. *Ecl.* 7.67, *Aen.* 5.264.

97–8 fatalis cannot mean ‘struck by the fates’; a specific and concrete effect on Arria is suggested. This effect is death, as *funera* indicates, though it means ‘causes of death’ (cf. *OLD* s.v. 3b), and *duo* is paradoxical. *fatalis* makes metaphorical death (cf. Antiph. 3.β.10) less probable. At all events, P. is more melodramatic than Honestus *AP* 9.292.2 (*GP* 2429) ‘a double pain, διπλὸν . . . ἄλγος, melted one woman’.

auarae and *inuito* create twists. Sympathy for Arria is modified at the end of the line; an approach to warfare common in elegy is surprisingly applied against a woman (contrast e.g. 3.12.5 *auari*, against Galla’s soldier husband). *inuito* deftly turns *contigit* from good fortune to bad: H. actually regrets his success. But structure and argument stress *uera*. The word invites comparison with Cassandra, cf. *uera* 52.

99–102 like 89–92 have *dixi, cum* and the result for the subject of the prediction and for the astrologer. They show a metrically related structure too; but here the extended first couplet expresses the protraction of the labour, underlined by *traheret* and *pondera lenta moram. illa parit* comes in 102 with expressive brevity. Posid. 96, 98–9 A–B, from the section ‘poems on healing’, show a related pattern: first couplet affliction, second healing. The genre suggests a wondrous intervention rather than, what can hardly be found in the text, the choice of the right moment in the process of the birth to make the vow (so Dieterich, *RhM* 55 (1900) 213–14; Montanari Caldini (1981) 38–9 suggests the mere prediction *facitis*: ‘your prayer is effective’). Cf. the inscribed epigram on a woman whose unnaturally long pregnancy was ended by Asclepius, *IG* iv² 121.3–10 (4th cent. BC). The astrologer’s answer must seem comically obvious, and scarcely astrological (contrast 102). To call on Juno Lucina in childbirth is standard (cf. e.g. Varro *LL* 5.69, Cic. *ND* 2.68; *CIL* vi 359.3 *u(otum) s(oluit)*). This is especially familiar to the narrator, who lives near a temple to Juno Lucina vowed by a woman (*II* xiii 2.120–1, 418, *LTUR* iii 122–3) and has a treatment of the analogous Greek practice in his proposed model (Call. *Aet.* fr. 79 Pfeiffer).

99 The name Cinara is hardly found anywhere (Cinarus *Suppl. It.* 5 (1989) pp. 65–6 (2nd–3rd cent. AD, Regium)). It must recall Horace’s mistress in *Epist.* 1.7.28, 14.33, *C.* 4.13.21–3, and indirectly the connected world of elegy. But in P. and Tibullus mistresses do not give birth. Presumed unmarried status (contrast *Arria*) makes *facitis* (99–102n.) less natural.

101 Iunoni (ς) conveys the appeal much more forcefully (*uota deum* in narrative Virg. *Aen.* 11.4, cf. 11.157–8); it suits *impetrabile* ‘effective, persuasive’ (*OLD* s.v. 2).

102 libris are again opposed partly to the narrator’s, cf. 63, 139–40.

103–8 The boastful differentiation from other means of prediction seems especially unmerited when the advice on Juno has been so close to religious

practice. The rhetoric recalls the narrator's at 1.8b.39–40 *hanc ego non auro, non Indis flectere conchis, | sed potui blandi carminis obsequio. haec* (ς) 103 leads more smoothly than *hoc* (Ω) into 107–8.

103 The oracle of Zeus Ammon, a foreign god (17), at the oasis of Siwa: 'sandy grove' fuses the contrast of desert and greenery (cf. Diod. 17.50.1, Luc. 9.523–5; for *antrum* cf. 4.4.3 with n., 9.33). At Juv. 6.553–5 women think astrologers equal this oracle's truth. *explicat* 'makes known' (*OLD* s.v. 8) looks secondarily to unrolling a book (*OLD* s.v. 1b), cf. 102: another jab at the narrator. A negative glance at Cyrene and Callimachus could be suggested too (cf. Cat. 7.3–6?).

104 'Or the liver that speaks of the gods entrusted to it.' In Etruscan haruspicy, different gods have houses in different regions of the liver, as on the bronze liver of Piacenza: cf. Jannot (1998) 34–8; Luc. 1.633–4. The astrologer, whose gods occupy the heavens (cf. e.g. Man. 1.803 *deis sedes*), presents this system with scorn; related contempt at Cic. *Div.* 2.34. In fact this system also involves locating the gods in regions of heaven: see M. Pallottino, *Saggi di antichità* (Rome 1979) II 779–90. For Etruscan books on haruspicy, and translations into Latin in the first century BC, see Jannot (1998) 22–4.

105 In augury a crow is an *oscen*: its cry, not its flight, is significant. Cf. Ap. Claudius *ap. Fest.* 214 Lindsay. Serv. *Ecl.* 9.15, Prob. *Ecl.* 9.13 (contrast Philarg. *Ecl.* 9.15) are dubious contrary sources; dubious too is *RRC* no. 287. Possibly H. is making a mistake. The language stresses triviality, and reflects philosophical debate: cf. Carn. F 9 Mette, *Lustrum* 27 (1985) 98.8–10 (did Zeus tell the crow to sing on the left?), Sen. *NQ* 2.32.3–4 . . . *si non a deo pennae auium reguntur*.

106 Summoning gods or dead to appear in a bowl of water was thought by Varro a practice used by Numa and deriving from Persia (*Curio, ap. August. CD* 7.35; *Div.* I app. IV Cardauns). This implies an intriguing light on the narrator's picture of early religion. The choice of the dead rather than gods makes a link to 4.7. Cf. further on hydromancy *RE* IX 79–86 (add e.g. *Suppl. Mag.* 65); *PGM* 4.3209–54, F. L. Griffith and H. Thompson, *The demotic magical papyrus of London and Leiden* (London 1904) I 33–9 (37 for dead).

107–8 The heavens are more sublime, and more suitable to revelations of the divine, than the lowly means of 104–6; cf. Man. 4.905–21 (but there *a fortiori* argument). *uerus* 'truth-telling' personifies (cf. 2.21.3 *Dodona uerior augur*, 3.8.17, 13.59, *OLD* s.v. 6c), like *petenda fides* (cf. e.g. Sal. *Jug.* 14.5). *uia* and *trames* denote the zodiac. Since *zonis quinque* comes after, and since *petenda fides* matches *uerus*, it seems unlikely to denote the five zones of the sky in general (as e.g. Varro *Men.* fr. 92 Cèbe); the zodiac goes between two of them (Virg. *G.* 1.233–9, Firm. *Math.* 1.10.5). It should rather denote the spheres of the planets, often counted as five (i.e. without sun and moon): cf. ζῳναι at e.g. Vett. Val. 1.9.19 Pingree, Paul. Alex. ch. 21, the same as ϰοῤῖραι at e.g. Ptol. *Synt.* 9.1. Scaliger's *stellis* is similar in sense.

109–10 H. turns back to the distant past not, like the narrator, to trace large historical and causal patterns but to prove a point. He should be supposed ignorant of 39–54. 109–18 do not riposte effectively, as they would if 39–54 had lauded

Calchas or the Greek victory; they are progressively undermined through 39-54. Calchas' injunction to sacrifice Iphigenia so that the Greeks could sail to Troy attracted dispute on prediction: cf. Enn. *Trag.* 185-7 Jocelyn (*astrology*), Lucr. 1.80-101 (cf. *uatum* . . . *dictis* and *minis* 102-9), Sen. Rh. *Suas.* 3.4 (augury). At first H. forcibly attacks the immorality of Calchas' prophecy. *pia* relates to both religion (cf. *impia* . . . *impia* Lucr. 1.81, 83) and family (cf. Ov. *Met.* 12.29-30). The personification in *pia* and *bene haerentes* (doing well to cling) makes ships and the very rocks more feeling than the humans. All grows out of *soluit* (untie to sail, *OLD* s.v. 4b), used in this story at 3.22.34 (and the spurious 3.7.23).

111-12 The actual killing of Iphigenia is often evaded, in events (3.22.34 *cerua*, Ov. *Met.* 12.29-34 etc.) or in narrative or visual form (e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 248-9; Lucr. 1.87-100 omits it from the detailed narrative, cf. *ibid.* 84-6; *LIMC* v 1.708-13, 719-22; internal evasion by Agamemnon: Cic. *Orat.* 74 etc., on Timanthes; cf. painting, Pompeii VI 8.3.5 (Naples inv. 9112; 1st cent. AD), *PPM* iv 552-3). Here it appears with full bloodiness.

†idem† would indicate a pointedly distinct action from 109-10, cf. e.g. 2.1.67, 69, 28.22, 4.2.39, 9.47; it may come from 99. *ille* (Hutchinson) would suit the rhetorical elaboration of the same essential action, cf. e.g. 1.5.7-8, 6.9-10, Tib. 1.5.29.

ceruice . . . tinxit 'stained with (the blood of) the neck', cf. N-R on Hor. C. 3.23.12-13 . . . | *ceruice tinget* (animal victim; phrase marked out at start of stanza).

et with *Atrides* means 'as a result', awkwardly. Wakker's *Atridis* (better *Atridae*, matching *Agamemnoniae* . . . *puellae* in sense) keeps the focus clearly on Calchas. It turns round the idiom *uela* (*uentis*) *dare* and heightens exploitation of the sail dyed red to tell Aegeus his son was alive (Simon. fr. 550 Page; 'give': Plut. *Thes.* 17.4, Serv. Auct. *Aen.* 3.74 *ut* . . . *uela candida nauibus daret*, cf. also Lucr. 1.100 *exitus ut classi felix* . . . *daretur*).

113-14 Calchas' prophecy was not only immoral but futile. Yet after 111-12 (and 3.9.40 *Danaum decimo uere redisse rates*) *nec rediere* . . . *Danai* seems a flagrant overstatement, though it grows out of 116; cf. 3.7.40 (115-16n.), Pacuv. 320 Ribbeck *periere Danai, plera pars pessum data est*. More significantly, 113-14 fit in with, but see less far than, the reversal of Greek victory in Cassandra's prophecy (53-4). *Danai* and the voc. *Troia* recall the voc. *Troia* and the voc. *Danai* that frame 39-54, and especially *Danai* . . . *Ilia tellus* | *uiuet* (54). Cassandra's *uiuet* contrasts with H.'s *diruta*, which is marked out by the paradox it produces in the imperatives. His attempt to discredit all prophecy is weakened.

Troy is to look at the *Euboicos* . . . *sinus* because they contain Aulis, on the mainland, but also those killed in the shipwreck on Caphereus (not itself in the bay). Cf. 115-16n., Eur. *Tro.* 82-6: the dead to fill the 'hollow recess (μυχόν) of Euboea'.

115-16 To avenge the death of his son Palamedes, Nauplius lured the Greeks on to the rocks of the promontory Caphereus with an apparently friendly beacon. Cf. 3.7.39-40 *saxa triumphales fregere Capherea puppes*, | *naufraga cum uasto Graecia tracta*

salo est, and e.g. Eur. *Hel.* 1126–31, Virg. *Aen.* 11.260 *ultorque Caphereus*, Sen. *Ag.* 557–78; Radt, *TrGF* IV 353–5. *porrigit* suggests a kindly offering, cf. *OLD* s.v. 6a.

P. pointedly exceeds the Trojan shipwreck, Virg. *Aen.* 1.118–19 *apparent rari nantes . . . et Troia gaza. exuuiis . . . pressa* ('weighed down') shows victory undone (contrast 47); *natat* secondarily suggests 'floats', cf. Sen. *NQ* 3.27.15 *orbem terrarum natare*.

117–18 Often paired with the destruction wrought by Nauplius is that which avenged the lesser Ajax's snatching of Cassandra from Athena's statue (in painting, Pompeii I 10.4 (1st cent. AD), *PPM* 276–9, she touches the statue's garment). Gods sometimes help Nauplius (so Her. *Aut.* 22.5, Stat. *Ach.* 1.92–4), but here Athena takes vengeance directly (cf. Alc. fr. 298 Voigt, with Hutchinson's nn., Virg. *Aen.* 1.39–45 etc.). H. entangles himself with personal divine causation. *uatem* of Cassandra at the end of this section is bound to recall 51–4 (*uatis* 51; of H. 75), and to make doubtful H.'s exclusion of prophecy. The command to the Greek victor makes H. resemble Cassandra (53–4) – save that his knowledge is narratorial, not prophetic. For such ironic imperatives, leaping into the past, cf. e.g. 3.18.17, Juv. 10.166. For the bigger point first (*rape*), despite the priority of *dilige*, cf. e.g. 4.8.80 *ueneat et . . . trahat* (n.), Virg. *Aen.* 2.353 *moriamur et . . . ruamus*; contrast Ov. *Met.* 5.395 *dilectaque raptaque*, Serv. *G.* 3.48.

119 *hactenus historiae* 'so much for myths'. Falsehood is not implied, and would not suit the argument; cf. e.g. 1.15.24, 4.7.64. Rather H. moves menacingly from the remote to the personal. The explicit organization is unlike the narrator's half; cf. *hactenus . . . nunc* at e.g. Varro *LL* 6.35, Cic. *Fin.* 4.14, Virg. *G.* 2.1–2. *hactenus* comes only here in P. But *deuehor* 'I am borne' takes up 70; H.'s discourse is to beat the narrator's.

120 'As for you, start attending calmly to your new (cause for) tears.' New because the narrator's poetic project is spoiled. It is hard to find any other explanation of *nouis*: 121–32 concern the past, the narrator is said to have heard 135–46 already, and *time* 150 is not a statement of new woes. *nouis* means 'new' in kind too: the reason for tears is connected to his old love (cf. 144); but it relates to his new literary plan. *lacrimis* is somewhat mocking, as the paradoxical *aequus* suggests (cf. Hor. *Epist.* 1.19.41 *lacrimae* (quotation) of literary disputes). 'Start' implies a shift at last from the narrator's wildness in 67–70, cf. e.g. Sen. *Med.* 537; it contrasts with his proposed *inceptis* (68). Ironically, the book will display tears generically new to the poet, the tears of others: Arethusa (3.4), Tarpeia (4.46), the mourners of Cornelia (11.1, 6, 57, 60).

121–50 H. immediately goes back to the narrator's beginnings; but his life seems less of a success story than Rome's. H. is again establishing his credentials through past knowledge (cf. Petr. 76.11). The life resembles the vicissitudinous retrospective lives narrated and analysed in Vettius Valens etc. (so *CCAG* VIII (4) 221.1–3, birthplace and moves; Vett. Val. 7.3.24 Pingree, *CCAG* II 168.26–8, premature death of father; Vett. 2.22.34–5 financial changes; Vett. Val. 7.6.164–75 love affair). But H. does not present his astrological evidence. The life gives

the reader a more substantial account of the narrator-poet than in earlier books, where there had been teasing pointers (esp. 1.21–2); *Tristia* 4.10, late in Ovid's *œuvre*, may be compared. Yet the narrator will lose his elegiac centrality.

121–2 It has already seemed likely that H. knows or refers to only the last part of 1–70 when he breaks in. Here he implies ignorance of 63–4; the possibility that he has in fact heard them adds to the comic play. He knows P's name (71), hardly from astrology; *notis* (cf. *noto* . . . *libro* 2.24.1) and the echo of 1.22.9–10 *Vmbria* . . . *me genuit* underline the possibility of derivation from P's text. The very name helps, rare in Italy save Rome and Umbria; cf. [125–6]n. (We need not ask how a part of Italy may be identified from astrology when Italy has only one ruling sign, cf. Housman, edn. of Manilius 4, xii–xv.) Yet H. interrupts his solemn beginning to draw out the effect of this startling knowledge; cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 3.46 (after proof) *num fingo, num mentior?* *tangitur* misleadingly suggests that an exact spot is found (*OLD* s.v. 7d).

123–4 Mevania (mod. Bevagna) lay in marshy land; cf. Fontaine (65–6n.) 28. The position of the *lacus* . . . *Vmber* and its relation to other lakes in the area are unclear; cf. C. Pietrangeli, *Mevania* (Rome 1953) 120–2. Lake Trasimene, in Etruria, cannot be meant (cf. e.g. Sil. 6.707; P. 1.21.2, 10, 2.1.29). If 121 were a self-contained parenthesis, and a precise location were intended, that location would not be particularly close to Perugia (1.22.3–10) or Assisi ([125–6]n.), and hence an accurate birthplace. But less confusing for the reader is an expansion of *patriae* . . . *ora* in 123–4, with the end of the parenthesis in 124. Umbria is made to sound strange and perhaps unattractive: misty Mevania, a tepid lake (cf. Kißel on Pers. 6.6–7 for the formation of *intepet*). Contrast 2.19.25–6, which paint the region of Mevania appealingly. The perspective is H.'s; it highlights by contrast the move to the great city. The historical connotations of Mevania are also pertinent: there Rome defeated an Umbrian and Etruscan uprising (308 BC, Livy 9.41.8–20).

cauo rorat . . . campo: the valley is moist and sunken (*OLD* s.v. *cauus* 2b).

[125–6] It seems too crude for H. to admit a knowledge of P's poetry and fame which would deprive 121–2 of their alleged basis in his astrological art. The tone also seems too lavishly deferential for H. The repetition of the striking *scandentis* after 65 is unattractive; 65–6 furnish an obvious source. *uertice* is awkward; *scandentique* could be read, but *scandentis* perhaps suits the gradual rise of the city seen from below, cf. M. J. Strazzulla, *Assisi romana* (Assisi 1985) plan 1. There is an evident patriotic motive for the insertion. P. seems actually to have come from Assisi: *CIL* IX 5405 locates his *municeps* there (Pliny *Ep.* 6.15.1). From Assisi and its territory come most Umbrian occurrences of his name, including *Sab. Texte* Um. 10.5 (in Umbrian; G. Bradley, *Ancient Umbria* (Oxford 2000) 206–7) and *AE* 1978 no. 294 (late 1st cent. BC; G. Binazzi, *Arch. Class.* 29 (1977) 188–90). *Asisi* (Lachmann) should replace the unattested *Asis*.

127–8 begin a section which is not derived from P's text, but will be taken by readers to amplify it. (Within the fiction, talk could be envisaged as a source.) 127–30 look to the last two poems of book 1. The reader may even at first relate

ossa legere to bones at Perugia (1.21.9–10, 22.7–8; cf. Livy 36.8.3 for *legere*); but the weighty | *patris* shows that the narrator is picking up the bones after the funeral as close mourner, cf. 2.24b.50, 4.11.14, Tib. 1.3.5–6, *CIL* v 7570.12–13. The loss of patrimony elaborates 2.34.55 *cui parua domi fortuna relicta est*, and joins especially with Tibullus' first poem (19–20, 41–2). *non illa aetate legenda* conveys sympathy from H., and anger from the implied author. Connected with *in tenues cogeris ipse lares* is H.'s and Apollo's forcing of the narrator into restricted poetry: *tenuis* 'poor' (*OLD* s.v. 10) plays on *tenuis* 'light', λεπτός, cf. 2.10.23–4 (poetic poverty), 3.9.29 *in tenues humilem te colligis umbras*, Call. *Ep.* 46.3 Pfeiffer, Hor. *C.* 2.16.14, 37–40.

129–30 Octavian's appropriation of land for veterans in 41 BC evidently affected Assisi; it probably lost land to the colony of Hispellum (mod. Spello). Cf. *ILLRP* 614, L. Keppie, *Colonisation and veteran settlement in Italy* (Rome 1983) 178–9. Octavian's actions led to war, centred on Umbria and on Perugia, which he besieged 41–40 BC. Cf. Suet. *Aug.* 13.3–15, App. *BC* 5.48–53, 58–9, 74, 86–7, 124–54, 201–7, Dio 48.13–15.1; Livy *Epit.* 126, Vell. 2.74.4 try to exculpate Octavian. P. names him in 1.21.7, not 2.1.29; here the ten-foot surveying rod replaces human agents (it is *impia* at *Dirae* 45). *excultas* conjures up a bitter speaker from the contemporary *Eclogues*: cf. 1.70 *impius haec miles tam culta noualia habebit*.

multi: pauci (Heyworth) would give less point to 128; for *cum* + *impf.* subj. of an action preceding the main verb or in progress cf. e.g. 2.30b.17–18, Ov. *Tr.* 5.1.57–8.

131–2 Between about fourteen and seventeen, usually at the father's direction, boys dedicated their locket, the father's gift, to the Lares, and assumed the *toga libera* or *pura*, conventionally at the Liberalia (17 March). Cf. e.g. Cic. *Ver.* 1.15.2, *Att.* 6.1.12, Ov. *F.* 3.771–88, Pers. 5.30–1; M. Harlow and R. Laurence, *Growing up and growing old in ancient Rome* (London 2002) 65–9. | *matris* poignantly takes up | *patris* 128; the *libertas* of the toga (cf. 3.15.3–4, Ov. *F.* 3.777–8) will be thwarted by Cynthia, and H. and Apollo. The moment takes up 3.15.3–6: initiation in poetry as well as love is swift (cf. Call. *Aet.* fr. 1.21–2, 37 Massimilla), and long before book 1 (see Intro. section 3). *mox ubi* suggests not instantly after the confiscation: 40 is likelier than March 41. P. will have been born c. 58 (41 + 17) to 54 BC, and be about thirty-eight to forty-two now.

133–4 intensively echo Call. *Aet.* fr. 1 Massimilla. They take the scene back to the start of the writer's poetic activity (contrast 3.3.1–26 and e.g. Virg. *Ecl.* 6.3–5). Cf. also *tonare* ('thundering is for Zeus, not me', Call. fr. 1.20), *dictat* (tablets fr. 1.21–2, cf. the Muses' near-dictation in fr. 9.23–6), *pauca* (fr. 1.1–32 – P. is briefer on brevity). Yet a work inspired by the *Aetia* is being discouraged; the Roman history of its subject-matter is what creates the disparity with the *Aetia*. Admittedly the narrator is being told to write poetry rather than oratory (*suo carmine* suggests good poetry in general, cf. 73–4n.). But oratory is equated with its stylistic heights (cf. e.g. Cic. *Orat.* 21 *fulmina* of the high style), and with immersion in Roman public life. The model Virg. *G.* 2.502 *insanumque forum* implies immersion; cf. also e.g. Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.77 (poets flee city), Mart. 7.63 (*foro* 12), Tac. *Dial.* 9.6; Call.

Ep. 28.1–4 (public places shunned). Fora appear often in book 4 (2.6, 4.12, 5.52, 8.76, 9.20, *al.*). The career choice links to the biographical 121–30, but is only a starting point. There is no father to pressurize, like Ovid's (*Tr.* 4.10.15–24).

135–46 If H. were the speaker, *elegos* would fail to exclude the proposal of 57–70; rather, Apollo implies the association of the genre with love (*elegi* comes only here in P.). 137–8 indicate a time before the narrator has begun love, i.e. the time of 131–4. 136 suggests the same of poetry, cf. 3.1.12–14 (imitators already). The prophecy is best ended with *nunc* 147: 139–46 seem to be elaborating the prediction of 137–8, with reference to Cynthia (the parallelism with 141–6 requires 139–40 to refer to the future too, cf. 142). Cf. Murgia (1989) 268–70. The end of a speech, if not indicated explicitly as usual, needs to be clear from the text: cf. e.g. 3.13.47 *at nunc*, 4.6.85, Hor. *C.* 3.5.41. For the inexplicit movement to direct speech cf. e.g. 4.6.79–80, K–S II 548–9. We thus have a prediction within a prediction, and the first divine speaker of the book; P's *œuvre* receives its *aition*. H.'s knowledge now seems quite possibly both intimate and authoritative.

135 *at* underlines the command (*OLD* s.v. 11c, Hor. *Epist.* 1.7.16, Ov. *Met.* 1.678).

fallax: elegiac persuasion is here regarded from outside as deceiving, and assisting the deception of husbands (cf. 3.3.49–50, Ov. *Tr.* 2.461–2); but it also cheats the poet (cf. 139–40), through Cynthia's own deception (146, cf. 140). Cf. e.g. Ov. *Ex P.* 4.2.41 *alea fallax*, *OLD* s.v. 2. *pellax* (Heinsius) would indicate deception too.

haec tua castra strongly suggests real warfare is already in the reader's mind, cf. e.g. 1.6.30 *hanc . . . militiam* (love), 2.14.24 *haec spolia*, Tib. 1.1.75 *hic ego dux* (Ov. *F.* 2.9 *haec mea militia* is supported immediately). The words, mediated by H., pick up the basic military element in Roman history which linked the narrator's project to epic (27–9, 46–7, 54). They point against dividing 4.1.

136 turba underlines the narrator's Callimachean isolation. Cf. 3.1.14, Call. fr. 1.25–8; Hor. *Epist.* 1.19.19–22.

137–8 The arms borne by Venus in 46–7 contrast. In the hexameter, *blandis* 'attractive' redeems *militiam*, typically the object of verbs like *patior*, *subeo*, *tolero*, *fero* (e.g. 1.6.30, Cic. *Fam.* 7.11.2, Sal. *Hist.* 1 fr. 11 Maurenbrecher; Diog. Oen. fr. 112.4–5 Smith). But the pentameter turns the narrator from Venus' soldier (cf. e.g. Hor. *C.* 4.1.16) to the Cupids' victim. The paradoxical *utilis hostis* implies the glory his poetry will give them: cf. 2.9a.40 *sanguis erit uobis maxima palma meus*. Heyworth's *dominae* remains appealing. For love and war cf. A. Spies, *Militat omnibus amans* (diss. Tübingen 1930), P. Murgatroyd, *Latomus* 34 (1975) 59–79.

139–40 See 135–46n. for the needful *pararis* (Murgia) and *eludet* (ς). *nam* presents the prolongation which increases the narrator's value to the Cupids – and ensures that his poetry will always treat Cynthia. *eludet* means not that she will not once sleep with him (cf. 145–6, and e.g. 2.14 and 15), but that he can never escape or reverse her brutal control (cf. 141–4). Hence the primary reference

of *palmas* is not to winning nights with other girls, in any case a triviality when Cynthia is so central to books 1–3. It refers rather to poetic success: cf. 3.1.8–12 (triumph for refined verse, cf. *labore*), Virg. *G.* 3.10–12; Ov. *AA* 3.403–4 (fame the reward for poets' *labor*).

141–2 Fishing is not in question (as Richardson sees); *ore* not *mento* would be used. Cf. also C. Mastroiacovo, *GIF* 53 (2001) 87–91. Plaut. *As.* 156 indicates the image: your mind is fixed here by Cupid's rivet (*clauo*); *ibid.* 157–8 indicate the shape: row and sail away, but the tide will bring you back. *uncum* and *ansa* should be different but combined means of fixing one object to another. Cf. Arnob. 6.16: statues held on base *uncis atque ansulis* (cf. 6.18); Hor. *C.* 1.35.19–20, Vitruv. 2.8.4 for *unci* and *ansae* in clamping. *rostro* suits a hooked shape; cf. *OLD* s.v. 2a, K. D. White, *Greek and Roman technology* (London 1984) 78. *mento* may point to a specific way of treating slaves. For *nil erit hoc* 'this will be no use' cf. Landgraf on Cic. *S. Rosc.* 58.

143 Presumably 'you will live every moment of your life as she thinks fit.' Here phrases for 'live' (be alive) are built on, like Lucr. 3.80 *lucisque uidendae*, Ov. *Am.* 2.14.22 *uidissem nullos . . . dies*. For the line of thought cf. Ov. *AA* 1.504 *arbitrio dominae tempora perde tuae*, Sen. *Polyb.* 6.4 (to an imperial secretary) (*non licet tibi*) *ex tuo arbitrio diem disponere*. 'Death' for *noctem* would not suit 4.7, nor would 'grief' suit idiom.

144 Enslavement is pushed to an extreme: the narrator is denied not only the *libertas* of speech (1.1.28) but spontaneous tears. Even slaves are free to grieve as they choose: so Cic. *Fam.* 11.28.3 (Matius). Tears are more usually 'ordered' by the self-controlled owner; cf. e.g. Juv. 6.273–5.

145–6 At first the lover seems to be on the threshold, seeking admittance: cf. *excubiis* 1.16.14; *signata* would mean: marked by his constant presence, cf. Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.163–4. But unexpectedly there emerges a quasi-conjugal enclosure of the mistress by the lover; cf. e.g. 2.6.37–40 *quos . . . tibi custodes, quae limina ponam . . . ? nam nihil inuitae tristis custodia prodest . . . excubiae* becomes a guard's watch (Ov. *Am.* 1.6.7 etc.). *signare*, however, used of containers, objects in containers etc., closed with a seal, can hardly be used of a door; if it could, it is incompatible with *rima* 'crack, gap'. *servata* (Hutchinson) would enable a shift between 'occupy' (*OLD* s.v. 3a) and 'guard' (*OLD* 1, cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* 1.6.63–4 *servare puellae | limina*). The generalization (cf. *est*) on 'the woman persuaded to cheat' (cf. *OLD* s.v. *persuadeo* 2 for the pass.) moves away, surprisingly, from the emphasis on Cynthia; the god's speech ends in comic hyperbole.

147–50 The narrator's gloomy future and the deterrent from his plans are already implied in Apollo's speech as presented. H.'s *nunc* introduces not absolute prediction but a warning (i.e. a prediction of bad news if ignored). The structure of 147–50 dismisses these obvious sources of danger in comparison with Cancer: cf. 2.17.5–10 (*uel* with subj. and *licet* + subj.), 3.22.7–17. It is a kind of priamel: 147–9 are foils to 150. But 148 further indicates a lover's immunity; cf. 3.16.11–14, Tib. 1.2.27–8 (29–30). For Cancer cf. perhaps Max. 99–101 (with metaphrasis):

do not let the Moon be in Cancer when you marry – your wife will speedily and acrimoniously leave you; Heph. *Apot.* 3.9.8 ‘the whole of Cancer is unlucky’ for marriage. Cancer might then figuratively represent the *discidium* (*diuortia* Ov. *Rem.* 693) which would be this lover’s worst fate. For accounts of other views, possibly less apt to 147–9 or without proper basis, cf. Montanari Caldini (1981) 73–85, Coutelle (2005) 534–8. Cancer would not be astrologically the most natural way to indicate Augustus (cf. G. Bowersock in K. A. Raafaub and M. Toher (edd.), *Between republic and Empire* (Berkeley 1990) 385–7); on *RIC* 1² Aug. 316 (reverse: crab holding butterfly), Durmius’ other issues should be borne in mind. Further theories involve: Cynthia; the chief decan; meaninglessness.

On a metapoetic level, generic pretention should matter little to the narrator fixed in love-elegy. For mid-sea cf. esp. 3.3.23–4 (historical epic); 4.1.40, 46–8 mention Aeneas’ voyage. The mere amorous warrior (135, 137–8) would enter war-poetry without weapons, cf. 3.1.7 the war-poet *in armis*, 3.3.40–2. 149 suggests Curtius from Roman history (cf. Livy 7.6.4 *patentes terrae hiatus*); his self-sacrifice *statuit monumenta* (3.11.61), ensured Rome’s eternity and proved the supreme importance to her of *arma uirtusque* (Livy 7.6.2–3, cf. D.H. *Ant.* 14.11.1–3).

148 armatis ‘towards armed men’; a dat. of motion (cf. e.g. 1.20.32) replaces *ad* as in e.g. Caes. *Gal.* 6.8.6 *infestis signis ad se ire uiderunt*.

150 ‘What you must fear is the unlucky shell of the eight-footed Crab.’ The lucky bird (68) and straight-galloping horse (70) of the narrator’s enterprise contrast (the earthly crab moves sideways; the heavenly rises upside-down, Man. 2.198–200). *octipedis*, echoed at Ov. *F.* 1.313, evokes Greek poetry: Nic. *Ther.* 605 ὀκταπόδην of crab, cf. Manetho 6.748 Kōchly πολυπόδῃ ‘many-footed’ of Cancer.

4.2: VERTUMNUS

4.1 has juxtaposed Rome’s evolution and the possibility of change for the poet. This poem proves that possibility, explores change in Rome, and makes change its theme.

A bronze statue had long stood at the edge of the Forum, in the Vicus Tuscus (primarily a street-name). It had no state cult; but first-fruits were placed in its hands. It was supposed to be of Vortumnus, possibly because he was thought the *deus princeps Etruriae* (Varro, *LL* 5.46; cf. 3–4n. for the belief that Vortumnus was Etruscan). Various causes may have contributed to the notion that he was a god of change, seen already in Hor. *Sat.* 2.7.13–14: etymologizing of *Vert-*; the appearance of the statue itself (1–2n.); supposition that *Voltumna* was both the same god as Vortumnus (possible) and feminine (false), cf. Varro *Div.* fr. 119 Cardauns *deae Voltumnae*, and 4.2.23–4. Pan-Etruscan meetings were held at the temple of Voltumna (Livy 4.23.5 etc.), quite likely at Volsinii (*CIL* XI 5265, cf. 4.2.3–4n.); one view is that **vel9umna* was a title of Tinia, the Etruscan supreme god (M. Cristofani, *Ann. Fond. Faina* 2 (1985) 75–88; against: G. Capdeville, *Ann. Fond.*

Faina 6 (1999) 109–35). See also on Vertumnus (V. in intro. and notes on this poem): Wissowa (1912) 287–8; Latte (1960) 191–2; W. Eisenhut, *RE* VIII 1669–87; G. Radke, *Die Götter Altitaliens* (Münster 1965) 317–20; A. J. Pfiffig, *Religio Etrusca* (Graz 1975) 69–71, 234–6. For the Vicus and the position of the statue, by the SE corner of the Basilica Iulia, see Boldrer 70, *LTUR* IV 310–11, V 213–4, *MAR* 272.

V.'s story embodies the Roman acquisition of foreign things, in this case willing gods. The book's poet-narrator, the aetiological mode of elegy and perhaps V.'s craftsman (62) have all been absorbed from elsewhere. V.'s statue, once wooden (59–60), displays Rome's rise in wealth. Strikingly, that rise here begins straight after Romulus (60); V.'s remaining rusticity adds more complications. The gods have exemplified the historical theme in 4.1. Cynthia's gold statue (4.7.47) will show one human's economic ascent, in a different period; so too the narrator's career (4.1.127–30, 139).

The generic context is both Callimachean and epigraphic. The *Aetia* sometimes explain unusual features of statues (fr. 35–8, 64, 110 Massimilla, 100–1 Pfeiffer (archaic and more recent statues of Hera)); *Iambi* 6, 7, 9 also treat of statues (7 history; 9 meaning). In 4.2 the appearance of the statue generates the inquiry, which encompasses the problem of V.'s etymology (7–48), itself taken through alternatives (11–12n.). Also treated is the history of the statue, and particularly the question of how an Etruscan god first came to be in Rome (3–4, 49–64; cf. the question in Call. *Aet.* fr. 89.21–4 Massimilla of why Icus worships a Thessalian hero). V. is made a nest of problems – but has a character. In *Iambi* 7 and 9 especially (on Hermes) Callimachus exploits poems written on statue-bases. So does P.; the whole poem is conceived as inscribed (1, 55–6, 57–64nn.). Various consequences ensue.

The addressee, a recurring feature of poems on statues, is not a *hospes* (4.1.1), but a revealingly ignorant Roman (cf. 1.37), with an urgent commitment in the Forum. This takes up the epitaphic motif of the passer-by pressed for time. The reading of the inscription is made comic, and comically implausible, by V.'s leisurely expatiation. The speaker is both god and statue, but especially statue; the interplay is used to limit the god. He has little power: his boasted power to change rests with the internal reader (21–48n.).

The most frequent god in inscribed and quasi-inscribed poems on statues (and herms) is Hermes. He often speaks, and comments on his making: its art (on copies of Alcamenes, *SGO* 03/02/35, 06/02/07, both 2nd cent. AD), or, more playfully, its lowly material (Nicaen. *APL*. 191 (*HE* 2699–701)). Cf. 4.2.59–64. The god of trickery makes an interesting predecessor for V.; but Hermes, unlike V., often stresses his utility or power: so *SGO* 02/01/03 (Hermes Tychon, 3rd cent. BC), 06/02/08 (Roman) and 09 (3rd–2nd cent. BC), cf. the closely related Priapus, *IG* XII 3.421 c (and d?) (3rd cent. BC). Hermes, Pan and Priapus are the gods especially evoked in 4.2; V. is made to belong with them. None of these gods is conspicuous for majesty; Priapus gains elegiac resonance from Tibullus 1.4. Priapus and Pan have strong rustic associations. Thus Priapus' statues and herms

appear in Augustan 'sacral-idyllic' landscape (e.g. stucco and painting from the Villa of the Farnesina, Rome, Mus. Naz. Rom. inv. 1072, 1233, I. Bragantini and M. de Vos (edd.), *Le decorazioni della villa romana della Farnesina* (Rome 1982) pls. 77, 222, cf. offering in inv. 1037, pl. 112). Despite his position, V. here retains many traces of the country.

This would make a long inscribed poem. There are certainly epigraphic precedents; so on *SGO* 01/12/02 (2nd cent. BC), sixty lines long and at least notionally on a statue-base, Aphrodite informs the passer-by about Halicarnassus. But in a genre marked by brevity, V.'s expansiveness and excursiveness become an incongruous loquacity. Gods can proclaim their deeds and powers in 'aretalogies' (cf. R. Harder, *Harpokrates von Chalkis und die memphistische Isispropaganda* (APAW 1943.14)); yet V. is made to sound less impressive than inappropriately and amusingly vain.

Brevity is also one of various issues that relate the poem to questions about elegy: the poem indicates the amplitude of elegy, especially for this book. V. parallels and demonstrates the narrator's change and the broadening of his elegy; the poem also displays the range now shown as inherent in the genre and exploited in book 4. The range of 'epic' (hexameter), as seen in the career of Virgil, may be glimpsed in the background (27–8, 39–4nn.). Ovid sports with the generic force of the poem when he metamorphoses P. back to epic in the Vertumnus episode (*Met.* 14.622–71, esp. 643–57; the generic play continues with Ariosto's spirit Vertunno, *Cinque canti* 1.102.1–8). Elegy's characteristic strings of couplets are used in 21–40 to express incessant change, within the couplet and as a series: medium and mobility interact. It is intimated that love is not after all to be excluded from the book; but more pervasive is the lightness of touch, the ludic element in the transformations. The individual changes do not advance a single generic argument; various points shine through at different moments. The suggestiveness and lack of definition suit the poem and introduce the book.

The intense Propertian poet-narrator is replaced in 4.2 by a winningly cheerful and talkative speaker. This drastic alteration is crucial for the book. The humour is both enlightening and misleading as a pointer to the rest. The book contains much play; but the subdued comedy of 4.2 is set against the subdued tragedy of 4.11, the other quasi-inscribed poem at the opposite end of the book. The god, unlike Cornelia, cannot die (cf. 4.2.61–2). His eternal, but self-concerned, perspective gives a different look to the opposition in book 4 of past and present. Above all, the poem enriches and complicates the opposition basic to the book between divinity and mortal.

Some discussions: G. Dumézil, *Latomus* 10 (1951) 289–99; T. A. Suits, *TAPA* 100 (1969) 475–86; Pillinger (1969) 178–81; J. H. Dee, *AJP* 95 (1974) 43–55; E. Marquis, *Hermes* 102 (1974) 491–500; R. Kassel, *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin 1991) 151–2; P. Pinotti, in *Colloquium Propertianum (tertium)* (Assisi 1983) 75–96; A. Deremetz, *REL* 64 (1986) 116–49; C. Shea, *ICS* 13 (1988) 63–71; G. Mader, *WS* 104 (1991) 131–47; Fox (1996) 154–8; J. Loehr, *Die Mehrfacherklärungen in Ovids Fasti und die Tradition des aitiologischen*

Dichtens (Stuttgart 1996) 198–208; S. H. Lindheim, *Ramus* 27 (1998) 27–38; Bolderer (1999); Rambaux (2001) 281–3; DeBrohun (2003) 169–75; Coutelle (2005) 571–3.

1 *Quid mirare*: an inscriptional start. Cf. *IG* II² 8388.3 (3rd cent. BC) ‘let no man wonder at this image’ (i.e. a puzzling relief), *SGO* 03/02/56, 08/01/96 ‘but why do you wonder?’. The wonder must be caused by sight of the statue, not previous knowledge (cf. 2); nor can there be *only* a metapoetic reading here. Nothing is now known of the statue; but anything with parts of two beings or types of being can be *biformis* (Centaur, Hermaphroditus, Janus, e.g. *Ov. Met.* 2.664, 4.387, *F.* 1.89); for *tot* cf. e.g. 4.11.70 (of three). One could imagine e.g. an Etruscan statue (misidentified) with wings and serpents, cf. bronze statuette (Vanø?), *Brit. Mus. inv.* 1449, 5th cent. BC (M. Cristofani, *I bronzi degli Etruschi* (Novara 1985) 106) and Charun or Tuxulya (F. De Ruyt, *Charun* (Rome 1934), Jannot (1998) 79–81). In regard to book 4, the start recalls the debate of *Aetia* fr. 1: the work is accused of being not ‘one song’ (Call. fr. 1.3 Massimilla). 62 rebuffs such an objection to the multifarious book 4. Bodies are often used to exemplify aesthetic unity. Cf. *Arist. Poet.* 1450^b36–51^a6 (with *Metaph.* M 1077^a20–36), Polyb. 1.3–5 and the monstrous disunity at *Hor. AP* 1–13. *quid mirare* contrasts with *quid mirare* at 3.11.1 on the narrator’s subjection to a woman.

2 ‘Learn about the ancestral statue of V.’ (ancestral from the addressee’s perspective). God and statue are blended; cf. e.g. *Cic. Ver.* 4.94 *expugnari deos patrios* (statue of Heracles), *Hor. C.* 2.18.26–7 *paternos . . . ferens deos*. For *accipe* cf. *Caes. Gal.* 6.21.2 (hearing of gods), *Stat. Silv.* 5.2.51–4 *disce, puer . . . , tu discere patrem*. For *signa* pl. for sing. (common in other senses of *signum*) cf. e.g. *Ov. Ex P.* 3.2.93 *simulacra*; but it has added point here. ‘Tokens’ etc. seem unlikely: the *signum Vortumni* (*Cic. Ver.* 1.154, *Livy* 44.16.10) is the poem’s subject.

3–4 The proclamation of Italian origin aligns V. with the narrator (4.1.63–6). The proclamation of Etruscan origin recalls Callimachus (*Aet.* fr. 97 Pfeiffer Τυρρηῶν start of *aition*, Etruscan wall in Athens speaking; *Ia.* 9 fr. 199 *Dieg.* Hermes of Etruscan descent). This shows the poet being a Callimachus after all (4.1.64), and links V.’s and Callimachus’ transplantations.

M. Fulvius Flaccus triumphed over Etruscan Volsinii in 264 BC (*II* XIII 1.74–5, 547), and built (probably) a temple of V. which celebrated his victory (Fest. p. 228 Lindsay, *LTUR* v 213–14; *II* XIII 2.191, 494–5 for the state cult). Transposition of 51–6 after 4 (Housman) muddles the history. *inter | proelia . . . deseruisse* suggests a willing departure, analogous to *euocatio* (G. Dumézil, *Archaic Roman religion* (Chicago 1970) II 424–7), not just capture of the Volsinian statue (cf. the hostile *Metrod. FGtHist* 184 F 12; *Ov. F.* 3.843–4). V. speaks as being his Volsinian statue too: the Juno of a given city can come to Rome when Rome already has a cult of Juno. *nec paenitet . . . deseruisse focus* attacks the horrors of Volsinii’s slave-ruled homes (*Val. Max.* 9.1 *ext.*2).

5 ‘This people delights me. Nor is it an ivory temple that gives me joy: . . .’ The statue-base (*CIL* VI 804), topography and line 6 show that this statue does

not have a temple (cf. 2.10.5–6 . . . *et uoluisse sat est*, 3.4.21–2, 9.35–44 – passages which link V. to the modest narrator). Fulvius' temple on the Aventine is glanced at here; but *eburno* probably goes beyond it to make a wider point on wealth. This ancient statue does not have the magnificence of Palatine Apollo's new doors with ivory work (2.31.12, cf. Cic. *Ver.* 4.124, Virg. *G.* 3.26–7; *tibia* . . . *eburna* at 4.6.8). The narrator likewise has no ceiling decorated with ivory (3.2.12). For *turba* see OLD s.v. 5c; it also conjures up the urban scene.

7–10 *posse uidere* (6) is given new point: V.'s position is made possible by the draining of the marsh which here extends into the Vicus Tuscus. (Cf. *LTUR* v 101–8, *MAR* 253–4, 4.9.5–6n.) The ignorance in *aiunt* underlines the point; it also surprises in a god (Ovid takes up the idea at e.g. *F.* 5.84, 86). *auditos* likewise contrasts with V.'s own vision in 6. The Tiber can journey, unlike the statue (*Tiberinus* is his most personifying designation). The draining is presented as his kind deed (cf. *suis* . . . *alumnis*); despite *Vert-umnus* and *deus*, it is not ascribed to V. (he is not the agent of *uerso*). *posse uidere* confirms his inert role.

On this etymology (cf. Ov. *F.* 6.409–10), V. must have had another name before Tatius (51–2, cf. 60); the supposed draining must have been after he came (cf. *postquam*).

The river's movement, and the sounds, contrast implicitly with those of the crowd in the Vicus Tuscus. *aiunt* points to the scholarly etymologies which put boats on the *Velabrum* (derived from *uehor* or *uela*, cf. 4.9.5–6n., Varro *LL* 5.43–4, 156), and still more to the scene in P.'s late colleague, Tib. 2.5.33–6. The echo of Tib. 2.5.34 *pulsa per uada* . . . *aqua* may be underlined by *auditos* . . . *sonos*. Remote and recent past interact.

9 tantum: 'exactly so much' is awkwardly undefined, 'such a large space' ineffectively overdone. Intrans. *concessit* 'gave place to' goes less well than trans. 'granted' with *suis alumnis*: a paradox would not convince. So an acc. is desired, like *spatium* (Heinsius) or maybe *terram* (Hutchinson; cf. Ov. *F.* 6.404 *nunc solida est tellus*).

11–18 V. was offered the first of produce; elsewhere fruit and flowers are mentioned (Ov. *Met.* 14.687–8, Col. 10.309). 13–18 give first-fruits of general produce of the year; 41–6 mention the custom again, but only for gardens. Heyworth's transposition of 13–18 after 44, though tempting, removes the connection of *prima mihi* 13 with *praecerpimus* 11 and of the seasons in 15–16 with *uertentis* . . . *anni* in 11; it breaks the sequence throughout 23–34, 37–46 (cf. *nam* 41) of objects held or worn by the statue. Flowers and vegetables, the prime features in Roman accounts of gardens, come in 43–6; those accounts (e.g. Columella 10, 11.3) show clearly that corn (14) would not be expected as characteristic garden produce. In both places V. loquaciously exceeds argumentative requirement in recounting his honours. The abrupt return to aetiology in 19–20 is lively.

11–12 'Or it is because I reap first the *turning year*'s produce that this produce is sacred to *Vert-umnus* [= that V. is my name]: so the people (?) believe.' What is believed is the etymology, not that the produce is sacred to V. The custom in

11 could not be the cause of the pious belief it presupposed (that the produce is sacred to V.); and such a belief would be far less naturally mentioned here. *credidit* is pres. in sense, cf. Ov. *F.* 5.167, 623; for the indic. in *or. obl.* cf. e.g. 3.9.41, Ov. *Met.* 4.782, 6.404–5, *F.* 4.795. The developing sentence leaves it unclear whether the people (?), or different members of it, also hold the etymology in 10, which will also be rejected; learned form and popular belief may be blended (see below). *rursus* is strangely placed to mark an alternative; 11 makes *rursus* unlikely to stress another honour. So the corruption should lie in *rursus*. For *uulgu* (ς) or *populus* (Hutchinson: an easier change) cf. Ov. *F.* 6.25–6 (*uolgique errore* on etymology). *Vertumno* (Ayrmann) is better than *Vertumni*: the offering hardly ranks as a rite (*sacrum* as noun).

A new etymology surprises: 10 had seemed final. In the *Aetia* the narrator lists various views on the Graces' parentage, and is given the truth by a Muse (Call. Sch. Flor. p. 76 Massimilla). He seems to have offered the alternatives on Artemis and childbirth (fr. 97 Pfeiffer *Dieg.*, with 'or because'). A *god's* presentation of different views about *himself* mixes scholar-poet and deity more unexpectedly. Cf. on alternative etymologies J. Loehr (work in intro. to this poem), Green on Ov. *F.* 1.319–32; 4.10.47–8n.

uertentis: cf. e.g. Cic. *Arat.* 333 Soubiran *annua . . . uertentia tempora*. *CIL* XI 4644a (Umbria) *Vertunno*, if rightly reported, may be relevant to the etymologizing from *uerto* and *annus*.

13 prima mihi goes with *coma . . . spicea* too. P. turns Hor. *C.* 2.5.10–12 *iam tibi liuidos | distinguet autumnus racemos | purpureo uariis colore* back from love-allegory: this poem is not love-elegy. See N–H on Hor. *C.* 2.5.12 and *OLD* s.v. *uario* 1b for *uariat*, of a specific stage in ripening.

14 Evocation of the *Georgics* (cf. 1.314–15 *spicea . . . messis; lactentia turgent*) shows the earlier gap between P. and Virgil removed: contrast 2.34.77–8 (*Georgics* on corn and grape). The division of city and country is also infringed.

15–16 The statue presents himself as a location of almost pastoral abundance: cf. Theocr. 11.45–8 (with 'sweet-fruited'), Virg. *Ecl.* 9.40–2 (with repeated *hic*).

dulces cerasos hints at modern luxury, not timeless rusticity: Lucullus imported the tree (a type with sweet cherries) c. 66 BC. Cf. Pliny *NH* 15.102, Serv. *G.* 2.18; Galen *Simpl.* 7.19, XII 22–3 Kühn. The fruit would come in the summer.

cernis is indic.: the addressee, no tourist (cf. 57), passes throughout the year.

17–18 The grafter is a modern figure, a slave with a specialism (cf. Pliny *NH* 18.329, Col. 11.1.8 and e.g. 4.10.2 *pampinator*). His triumph in the hexameter is set against the tree's discontent in the pentameter. Cf. Callimachus' haughty laurel (*Iambus* 4), and the pleasure of the ennobled apple-tree in Pallad. *Insit.* 77–80.

19–20 are cognate to the more startling moments where Pindar (*Ol.* 9.35–41) and Callimachus (fr. 75.4–9 Pfeiffer) interrupt their own impious discourse. Here V., after elucidating the second etymology with satisfaction, brusquely spurns both etymologies, and seizes control of his own name (cf. in Callimachus, *Iambus*

9 Hermes' explanation of his own statue, wrongly and rudely interpreted by the viewer). He has someone else (*alius*) to report on his name – himself: another Pindaric touch. Cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 3.27–9: Apollo needed no Hesiodic crow to inform him; he heeded a very sound colleague – his omniscient mind. V. will not let Fama be *index*: she is told to pause from her restless activity, shown by the two etymologies. (Unpersonified *fama*, a specific rumour, would apply only to the second etymology and make V. ignore the first.) Cf. 2.9.19 *uacare* of the active Cynthia, 4.11.23 *uaces* of Sisyphus; Virg. *Aen.* 4.173–97 etc. for Fama's hyperactivity, Ov. *Met.* 9.139 for her *mendacia*, Ex P. 2.1.21 for her as *index*; P. 2.18.37 *credam ego narranti* . . . *Famae*. The false etymologies are not harmful (*noces* N); cf. Housman (1972) 1300–1.

modo underlines *tu* and the imperative, cf. 1.11.27 etc.

21–48 The true etymology: V. can be turned (*uerite* 22) into all forms (*cunctis* 21 implies *omnis*, 47–8n.). *uerite* removes the transformation from V's agency. Gods had shown their power by self-transformation from Homer on; here the transformation is produced by the person who puts props on the statue. The plethora of props is unlikely to reflect actual practice. The second person in 22, 25, 31–2 (cf. 26, 30) could be impersonal (cf. e.g. Ov. *Tr.* 1.1.47 *da mihi Maeoniden*); but the involvement of the addressee at 16 (cf. 26, 30) and just before at 20 makes it more likely the transformer is the addressee. Unlike Ovid's V., the statue can initiate nothing.

V's lack of fixity does make some contrast with humans. This contrast is enhanced by the string of specific occupations in 25–8, 33–40. Such strings particularly recall series of predicted professions in astrological works: cf. e.g. Ptol. *Tetr.* 4.4; for poetic elaboration cf. Man. 5.32–709, Dorothea p. 431 Pingree, Anub. P. Oxy. 4505, Manetho e.g. 1.294–305, 4.333–40 Köchly. There is thus a link with 4.1. The series establish one occupation for each person; V. can do them all. Yet the fact of this poem proves that the human narrator can change his predicted lot. 23–4 confirm a relation between his project and V.; 23–40 take the archetypal elegiac form of the catalogue outside love-poetry. Strings of activities had formerly justified the restriction of P's poetry to love (2.1.43–6, 3.9.7–20). V. and the city poet are made to contrast by the predominance of the rural in 23–40 (cf. 2.5.25–6, 4.1.12). The images are related to the emblematic figures which mark rusticity in landscapes: cf. Pliny *NH* 35.116 (fishing etc.), and e.g. Rome, Mus. Naz. Rom. inv. 1072 (intro. to this poem), also in I. Baldassare et al., *Pittura romana* (Milan 2002) 140, together with (201) painting from Pompeii, Naples inv. 9488 (1st cent. AD).

21–2 cunctis . . . in quamcumque uoles: V's pride and showmanship are reinforced by the catalogue. Ovid takes up the language of 21–2: *Met.* 14.652 *multas . . . figuras, 685 formasque apte fingetur in omnes*. But 'all' suggests a wider range than the shifts into different jobs which in fact predominate after 23–4: 23–4, by contrast, present a real change of *figura* (Cic. *Tim.* 45 (= φύσις), Virg. *Aen.* 6.449), like the general change of god to man (Hor. *C.* 1.2.41). Cf. e.g. Ov. *Met.* 11.253

centum mentita figuras (Thetis), 12.559 *formas uariatus in omnes* (Periclymenus). *decorus* contains in the background a Cynthia-like pride in beauty; its primary meaning here ‘fitting’ is unusual of a person in relation to a thing (Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.83 (Lucan’s wife) *doctam atque ingenio tuo decoram* is less unusual).

uerte dramatizes the act more than *si uerteris*. Cf. e.g. Ov. *AA* 2.647, 3.594, 628.

23–4 play elaborately with P’s elegy. Coan cloth is significantly placed in earlier books (1.2.2; 2.1.5–6; if I see her in *Cois*, *totum de Coa ueste uolumen erit*; a probable development in 3.1.1 with Philetas of Cos, cf. Intro. section 3). Love-elegy will evidently not be excluded from this book; cf. 4.5.23 (Coan cloth near beginning of Acanthis’ speech). 23–4 toy with the idea of the mistress’s beauty in various clothes, aspects, situations (2.1.5–14, 3.9–22, cf. (various clothes) 4.5.22–3, Ov. *AA* 2.297–302, [Tib.] 3.8.11–12 (V. follows there: P’s point is seen)). *non dura* not only signals elegy’s softness (so 2.1.2, 34.42; 4.4.62, 5.5, 6.5, 10, 71nn.); the negative itself has characteristic ethos, cf. 3.23.17 *non stulta*, Cat. 10.4 (cf. also P. 2.22*b*.43).

The lines are actually, for P, hyperelegiac in ethos and content. A ‘low’ naughtiness is insinuated through the play on transparent *Coae* (Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.101–2) and on making bodily parts seem evident (cf. Juv. *Sat.* 3.95–7) by assuming, not removing, clothes. Contrast Call. *Ia.* 9 fr. 199 Pfeiffer (Hermes’ erection). The drastic indeterminacy of sex goes further than the usual gender reversals of elegy. Cf. Man. 5.142–56 (with Manetho 5.139–41 Köchly) – a portrayal of effeminacy that seems targeted (cf. 156) at elegy and its narrators – esp. 146–7 *cura . . . frontis . . . decorae* | *semper erit* (cf. 21–2n.), 151–3 *odisse . . . uirum, femineae uestes, mollia*.

The acting prepares one strategy of book 4 for moving towards love-elegy: the loving Arethusa is in a sense ‘acted’ by the author in the next poem. The acting here appears as virtuoso falsehood: a bronze statue in silks remains *dura*.

25 V. as a *faenisex* (*faeniseca*, χορτοκόπος). On the mowing of grass for hay see e.g. Col. 2.16–18, Pliny *NH* 18.258–63. The hay, perhaps put round the head after the mowing itself, is echoed at Ov. *Met.* 14.645–6 *tempora saepe gerens faeno religata recenti* | *desectum poterat gramen uersasse uideri* (cf. also 648 *iurasses*, 649 *falce data*).

26 A double deception: the *statue* of V. is a mower. This advances on standard artistic illusion: cf. e.g. Hdas. 4.32–3 ‘the work will speak, you will say’, Posid. 66 A–B, Leon. Tar. *AP* 9.719 (*HE* 2508–9; cow is real, was grazing). Virg. *Aen.* 8.691 *credas* makes a different advance (hyperbolic image within ekphrasis). *iurabis* stresses the untruth.

27–8 *laudabar* and *eram* suggest not one-off moments but stages; for the perf. thus with *quondam* cf. e.g. Hor. *AP* 396–9, Ov. *F.* 5.57–8, *Tr.* 3.1.7. *memini* plays on the god’s long life (cf. e.g. Ov. *F.* 5.646) and vanity. It is disputed whether Veltune, a male with spear on mirror, Florence 77759 (4th cent. bc), is related to V.

The metapoetic reading of 27 that best fits *quondam* is to refer *arma tui* to elegy’s martial subject-matter in the past. Cf. Hor. *AP* 401–3 (Tyrtaeus as an early warlike poet); Simon. frs. 1–18 West, *SH* 958. For poets holding the weapons etc. of figures

in their genres, cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* 2.1.15–17, 18.13. 4.6 and 10 are prepared. 27–8 also point to Virgil's changes (2.34.63, 77–8).

imposito pondere feigns the feelings of a real reaper with a basket full of real corn (cf. e.g. Varro *RR* 1.50.1; Ov. *Met.* 14.643–4). The phrase prevents *corbis* from seeming like a thing worn or a weapon (*TLL* s.v. *in* 770.1–19); *in* (N+) should not be kept.

29 sobrius ad lites: the absence of both subject and verb is stylistically dubious. *cum est* (NA) is not found in Augustan poetry outside Horace's *Satires*. A positive occupation would be welcome, and a relation to the nearby Forum expected (cf. e.g. Hor. *C.* 4.2.43–4 *forumque* | *litibus orbum*, Sen. *Marc.* 26.4 *fora litibus strepere dies perpetuos*). Perhaps say *ad lites uado* (Hutchinson; *adsum* Lee); *cum imposta corona est* (Lee): V. is an orator, or lawyer, off to work (cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.13.21–2; Anub. P. Oxy. 4505 fr. 2.9–10). Such occupations were not for the narrator (4.1.134). Cf. 37 for play on V.'s motion.

imposta: not colloquial; cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 1.249 *compositus*.

30 clamabis parallels *iurabis* 26, pointedly. Something different on the brow, and the same person will adopt a different and strong belief on the same statue.

31–2 Something else again on the head (cf. *capiti* 30) leads to a new supposition: not a drunk man, but the god of wine. The neat chiasmus of 31–2 highlights a further amazing transformation, as do *modo* (you have only to) and *plectra* (a small object). 31 takes up 3.17.30: through a future poem on Bacchus, *cinget . . . mitra comas*. This sets in the background ideas of changing or expanding genre and of the poet's role in creating gods. In book 4 the generic implications of Bacchus and Apollo go beyond love-elegy (4.1.62, 4.6 (4.6.75–6n.); contrast 3.2.9–10). *speciem furabor* may play on artistic deception (Lucian *AP* 11.433.1 = *Ep.* 56 Macleod 'painter, you steal forms'), and the cheeky notion of divine theft (e.g. *Homeric hymn* 4, Eratosth. fr. 1 Powell, Hor. *C.* 1.10.9–12 (all Hermes), Ov. *Am.* 1.1.7 (stealing attributes), Nonn. *D.* 24.280–2).

33–4 recall 3.13.43–6, where P. translates Leon. Tar. *AP* 9.337 (*HE* 2143–6): Pan offers to help in hunting or fowling himself. The range of elegy and book 4 is intimated by this strong reminder of epigram (on a statue); the size of 4.2 is also emphasized.

The point in 3.13 is human innocence; here *sum deus* underlines both the lowly pursuit for a god and this god's cunning. Cf. 4.6.60 *sum deus* (Julius Caesar); for *sum* after the caesura cf. e.g. Ov. *AA* 2.548.

V. does not here become *Faunus* (ς), i.e. Pan (cf. e.g. Ov. *F.* 2.267–82, 5.99). The allusion to 3.13 makes it unlikely that he would be Faunus only in the second part; and he must be two different beings in 33–4. A gloss *Faunus*, however, may have affected the text. *aptus*, say, would be possible; attractive is *factus* (Boldrer) 'trained, fitted', cf. 4.5.49 *non factus amori*, Cic. *Att.* 2.24.3, *Pis.* 59 *factus ad persuadendum*. On nets, sticky reeds, feathers see e.g. Grat. 24–60; Lyc. 105, Dionys. *Av.* 1.1, 3.16, Isid. *AP* 7.156. Fowling, which gets most attention here, is less common in art than hunting or fishing (37); but cf. painting in Pompeii I 8.15, *PPM* 1 846.

The narrator-lover claimed an intention to take up hunting etc., but dubiously (2.19.17–26).

[35–6] (del. Fontein) disregard the crucial props, and the first-person form, while adding items with an informative *etiam*. (A climactic *est etiam* . . . *Vertumnus* seems uncalled-for by the content.) Cf. the probably spurious elaboration on V., Ov. *Met.* 14.651 *miles erat gladio, piscator harundine sumpta*: see R. Tarrant, *HSCP* 100 (2000) 425–7. *est* is initial, but means neither ‘there is’ nor ‘is’ (3.18.22 *est mala sed* is concessive: see Adams (1994) 77–80). *eius*, suspiciously, is rare in most Augustan poetry (and used in arguably spurious lines at Hor. *C.* 3.11.18, 4.8.18); cf. 4.6.67–8n. *est* . . . *aurigae species* . . . *et* underplays the transformation wanted in each couplet; *species* is probably based on Ov. *Met.* 14.644 *uerique fuit messoris imago*. The lines interrupt the expected link of fishing (37) with hunting and fowling; cf. e.g. Leon. Tar. *AP* 6.13 (*HE* 2249–54), much imitated, and inscribed with picture in Pompeii V 1.18, *PPM* III 569 (1st cent. BC). Emendation can remove some difficulties, but the cumulative impression suggests this is not the best approach (cf. H.-Chr. Günther, *Quaestiones Propertianae* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 169, 1997) 124–5).

For the *desultor*’s act see e.g. Livy 23.29.5, 44.9.4, *ILS* 5050.154, Man. 5.85–7.

37 petaso: a large hat to protect the fisherman from the sun. Cf. W. R. Smyth, *CR* 62 (1948) 14. Fishermen, like other rustics, often wear hats in art (e.g. bronze statuette Karlsruhe inv. F 974, early Imperial, H. P. Laubscher, *Fischer und Landleute* (Mainz 1982) 105–6, pl. 13, cf. pp. 7–8). After *harundine* 33, which is more or less a synonym of *calamo*, a further prop is needed; *hoc in suppetat hoc* (Ω) is unsatisfactory, like *hic* (Heinsius).

ibo plays on the statue. Cf. e.g. Pind. *Nem.* 5.1–2 (statues cannot move); Diod. 4.76.2, Gemin. *AP* 9.740.1–2 (*GP* 2362–3; statues seem able to); Cat. 67.37–40 (play on door).

38 The salesman of luxuries to women wears his clothes decadently ungirt (Ov. *AA* 1.421 *institor* . . . *discinctus*; Kißel on Pers. 3.31). *mundus* ‘elegant’ is from his viewpoint; cf. Man. 5.267, Sen. Rh. *Con.* 1 *pr.* 8. For *institores* see Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 17.20.

39–40 Allusion to 3.13.29–30 *mixta referre* | *lilia uimineos lucida per calathos* (golden age) indicates the blurring of divisions between present and past. *pastor* may point again to the changes in Virgil’s career (cf. 26–7; 2.34.67–76). *possum* plays on the fixity of statues.

Heyworth well notes the difficulty of 40. *medio puluere* should not refer to country roads (carts would be used to transport roses), the Circus (*medio* surprises) or summer (‘even’ would be expected of picking roses so late). None is indicated clearly; all are too complicated for 23–40. But *ferre* seems sound, cf. 3.13.29 *referre*, roses are carried from the garden to be sold, cf. Col. 10.303–11. *medio* in Heyworth’s *uendere/cogere uere* does not suit the expected May (*Anth. Lat.* 391.17–18 Shackleton Bailey; dates of Rosalia). Another approach might be *mollis pondera ferre rosae* (Hutchinson). This would contrast with the inactivity of the shepherd (perhaps old, cf. Pliny *NH* 35.25; idle shepherd with stick e.g. sarcophagus, Rome,

Mus. Naz. Rom. inv. 1084, 4th cent. AD, A. Giuliano (ed.), *Museo Nazionale Romano. Le sculture* 1 10.1 (Rome 1995) 54–5). It would advance the play on reality and pretence in 28 *imposito pondere*. A rose seems nothing; stuffed basketfuls may to the carrier, *gerulus*, seem less so (cf. Col. 10.303–11).

41–2 Holding baskets of flowers leads V. to mention the garden produce often put directly into his hands (cf. Ov. *Met.* 14.687–8, of fruit). *maxima fama* gives the reason why the mention, elaborated in 43–6, would be superfluous. Such *praeteritio* is common rhetoric (cf. e.g. Cic. *Sest.* 129 *nam quid ego . . . senatus consulta commemorem?*, *ILS* 212 I.29–37); but the irrelevance to the argument on etymology indicates humour on V.'s loquacious conceit. There were probably numerous productive gardens on the periphery of Rome: see A. Carandini, in *Misurare la terra . . . materiali da Roma e dal suburbio* (Modena 1985) 66–74, cf. W. F. Jashemski, *The gardens of Pompeii* (New York 1979–93) 1 chs. 14–15.

probatā 'approved, choice', probably from experts', not V.'s, point of view. Cf. *probatas* at e.g. Col. 3.4.1, Pliny *NH* 15.31, Stat. *Theb.* 6.76.

43–4 The cucumber (?), gourd and cabbage give a comic context to the proud *me notat* 'marks me out, makes me famous' (cf. e.g. Luc. 9.954: Hellespont *amore notatum*). *caeruleus* can describe things we think green (olive leaves e.g. Ov. *AA* 2.518); the cabbage is probably bound in growing rather than for presentation to V. (contrast Ov. *F.* 4.870).

The use of Virg. *G.* 4.122 (I would sing of how) *cresceret in uentrem cucumis* brings out that V.'s *praeteritio* crams in two more vegetables than Virgil's – though V.'s space problem is more acute (57–8, Virg. *G.* 4.147–8), and vegetables were important in Nicander's *Georgics* (fr. 72 G–S gourds, 85 cabbage). As well as V.'s garrulity, elegy's range comes in: Virgil had left these subjects *aliis post me memoranda* (*G.* 4.148).

45–6 Thanks to growing beneath glass etc. the flowers from gardens have already been offered to V., and died, before the same species have opened in the meadows. Cf. Mart. 4.22.5–6, 8.14.1–4. For *hio* cf. Col. 2.9.18. *decenter* is too near to *impositus* to go directly with *languet* in a paradox (cf. Ov. *AA* 3.291 *lacrimare decenter*); but beauty in dying is not precluded (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 11.68–71 on picked flowers, with *languentis* 69). *decenter* picks up the hinted vaunt of beauty in 22 *decorus ero*. The inclusion of all species is naturally hyperbolic; cf. 21–2n.

47–8 essentially repeat 21–2. *uerte* is enough there to guide the reader to the etymology from *uerto* (already seen in Hor. *Sat.* 2.7.13–14); *cunctis* (and *quancumque*) should sufficiently suggest *omnis* there after 10, 12. (At Ov. *Met.* 14.685 *formasque apte fingetur in omnes*, perhaps *apte* is played on and *fingetur* stands in for *uertetur*.) An addition of *unus* to explain the *ū* of *Vertumn-* would be unwelcome: *u* is needed for *omnis*, as in the harder *-umn-* for *-amn-*, *-ann-* 10, 12 (cf. e.g. *CIL* 1² 1834.2, 6 *colomnas*). If spurious (suspected by Hutchinson), the lines would be spelling things out. There are oddities: *euentu* 'fact', awkwardly taking up the *quod*-clause, is a strange use of *euentus* (Pliny *NH* 13.65 is unhelpful: cf. 1.16 (91), 16.242). Ov. *F.* 1.59 *omen ab euentu est* would be a plausible source for *nomen ab euentu*. After 47

patria lingua should mean Latin; but with V. it should mean Etruscan. *at mihi* may be defended by 4.7.23 (corrupt?); but when *at* + pron. opens a sentence, one might expect, if not a new or contrasted person, contrasted content or a turn to action (cf. 1.16.41, 2.5.17, 3.1.21, 4.1.135). Heyworth's: 47, *lac.*, 51–4, *lac.*, 48 seems to leave the apparent etymological revelation in 19–46 without a clear point.

49–54 Etymology exhausted, V. returns (cf. 3–6) to explain how he comes to be in Rome though Etruscan. If 47–8 should be inauthentic, we could adopt the more plausible opening for a new section *at tu* (TT). The Roman state, in its king, can be set against the individual and rural-seeming dedicants. Giving, and *meis*, form a link.

Varro is reported by Serv. *Aen.* 5.560 as saying that one of the *lucumonibus* (*id est Tuscis <regibus>* (Hutchinson)) came with his army to help against Tatius and was given part of the city; hence the Vicus Tuscus. Save for the view of *lucumo* as a common noun, this comes closest to V.'s pro-Etruscan version. (Cf. M. Cristofani, *Archeologia Classica* 43 (1991) 553–7 for *lauχ(u)me* as an Etruscan proper name.) P. 4.1.29 makes the leader *Lycmon* (*Lucumo* Junius fr. 4 Funaioli, *Cic. Rep.* 2.14; D.H. *Ant.* 2.37.2 Λοκόμων); *Lycomedius*, then, should be the people, sing. for pl. as e.g. 4.6.79, Virg. *G.* 2.497, *Aen.* 8.474; so Fest. p. 107 Lindsay *Lucomedi a duce suo Lucomo dicti*. At Varro *LL* 5.46 the leader is Caeles, given the Caelius Mons; the more suspect of his followers are moved after his death to the safer Vicus Tuscus. Livy 2.14.9, D.H. *Ant.* 5.36.4, *al.*, make the settlers in the Vicus remnants of Porsenna's army (c. 508 BC). Tatius' 'crushing' (*contudit*) is unique: usually neither side has a decisive victory when the Sabine women intervene (e.g. Livy 1.12.10, D.H. *Ant.* 2.44); Lucumo is slain (*Cic. Rep.* 2.14; D.H. *Ant.* 2.43.2, where the Etruscans are routed).

49 praemia pl. for sing.; cf. e.g. 4.4.94.

50 hodie juxtaposes with the history the present Vicus Tuscus, where luxury goods, especially clothes, were sold by disreputable sorts (Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.228, Mart. 11.27.11, *ILS* 7575, 7597). Cf. *LTUR* v 195–7, *MAR* 272.

52 V. does not accept that Tatius introduced his cult ('*Ann. Pont.*' fr. 11 Chassignet).

quoque (Morel): *atque* + consonant is very doubtful (at 2.26.8 change is easy, at 3.13.39 needed; *atque* 54 would explain the error here). Two *quos* would be acceptable: the Etruscans' arrival is separated from the victory by at least the capture of the Capitol (4.4); cf. D.H. *Ant.* 2.37.2.

53–4 The description, though generalized, moves this elegy into epic territory. 4.10, and 4.6, will explore further. Even military prose is evoked: cf. e.g. Livy 4.43.2 *turpi fuga funduntur*, 3.1.41.14; perhaps Tac. *Hist.* 3.23.1 *labentem aciem* (Livy 7.15.4 *labantem*).

uidi ego: the god joins past and present; but he merely observed.

55–6 move from the far past into the future; eternal existence for Rome (*OLD* s.v. *aeuum* 1c) is set against the enemy's defeat. *sed* turns to a request for action; the eternal god marks his lowly status by praying like a human, to a greater

god. 55–6 present a false ending, before the comic continuation in 57. Cf. e.g. the endings 1.17.25–8 (*at*, to Nymphs); Call. *Aet.* fr. 112.8 (to Zeus, to preserve Ptolemies); *Inscr. Cret.* II x.19.7–8, 2nd cent. BC ('but (ἄλλά), Zeus, preserve his son'), *SGO* 01/10/02.4–5, 6th cent. AD ('but may god grant his and his family's name endures long'). Rome's everlasting success was prayed for at the Secular Games of 17 BC: *ILS* 5050.94–5, 127–8, cf. *CIL* VI 32329.11. The false closure draws on a grandiose scene early in the *Aeneid*: Jupiter, *sator . . . deorum* (1.254), grants eternity (278–9) to the *Romanos, gentem . . . togatam* (282). We do not know the date of Augustus' rule on togas in the Forum, linked with *Aen.* 1.282 (Suet. *Aug.* 40.5).

57–64 1–56 are quasi-inscribed no less than 59–64, as beginning and end confirm (1, 55–6nn.); so are 57–8. A sudden shift to inscription for 59–64 would be strange, and does not fit 58. 59–64 should not, then, be marked out by capitals (in any case a bad idea: 4.3.72n.). They are closely connected with what precedes: they finish the statue's history, and in particular the story of V's presence in Rome. They also account for the statue's form (1), and are highly aetiologically: cf. esp. Call. *Aet.* fr. 100–1 Pfeiffer, about two statues of Hera on Samos, the first crude and wooden, typical of its time; *Ia.* fr. 196.59–61, 197.2–3 (with *Dieg.*) for speaking of makers. 57–8 are best seen as an anxious interjection, not part of the announced and minimized remainder; *superant* (only six left) seems too animated to lose (*suberunt* Heyworth).

57–8 Among the passing *turba togata* is the addressee, desperate *ad uadimonium uenire*: failing to appear at a hearing in the Forum as thus agreed meant the loss of a large sum. Cf. Gai. *Inst.* 4.184–7. This gives a comic version of epigraphic addressees, cajoled to pause: cf. e.g. *CIL* I² 1209.1–4 *adulescens, tametsi properas*, VI 25703.2–3 *tu qui tendes iter properatim* (25063.9 *ne propera* mid-inscription; promises of brief delay e.g. I² 1211.1, VI 25427.3). See also N–H on Hor. *C.* 1.28.35. 'I am not delaying you', justified by *haec . . . meis*, is made ludicrous by 1–56, already perused. *creta*, the chalk line ending the runner's circuits (*OLD* s.v. *spatium* 1b), opposes the statue's metaphorical speeding to the addressee's. Lucr. 6.92–3 (same image, with *currenti*) confirms the idea of running.

59–62 The V. that was brought from Etruria was of wood (cf. e.g. Tib. 1.10.19–20 (gods of old were wooden); R. Meiggs, *Trees and timber in the ancient Mediterranean world* (Oxford 1982) 321–4). With such a statue the god is poor; cf. 4.1.21 (sacrifice), Luc. 9.515–21 (temple); this indicates in itself Rome's poverty (Varro *Vit. Pop. R.* fr. 295 Salvatore). *ante Numam* in 60 (where *grata* is 'pleasing to me') changes C. Laelius' comment on how pleasing (*grata*) to the immortal gods were crude vessels left by Numa himself (*ORF* 20 F 15–16, Pease on Cic. *ND* 3.43). *ante Numam* likewise opposes the view that Numa eschewed divine statues (Plut. *Num.* 8.12–14; Varro *Div.* fr. 38 Cardauns). Here Numa, the great developer of Roman piety (Livy 1.19.4, 21.2 etc.), brings what V. thinks a fine rise, to bronze: the later gold etc. are beyond V's ken (cf. e.g. Varro *Vit. Pop. R.* fr. 295, 325 Salvatore). Here Rome's ascent in prosperity begins soon (contrast Pliny *NH* 34.15: first bronze statue

made there 493 BC). This version deploys Mamurius, whom Numa rewarded for his accurate *ancilia* by incorporating him at the end of the Sali's song. Cf. D.H. *Ant.* 2.71.2, Ov. *F.* 3.379–92 (with *ū*) etc.; *II* XIII 2.422. 62 might allude to his expulsion from Rome, reported at Lyd. *Mens.* 4.49 pp. 105–6 Wunsch (contrast Serv. *Aen.* 7.188). He may have been supposed Oscan too; cf. Fest. p. 116 Lindsay (the praenomen Mamercus (*ā* Juv. 8.192) Oscan), Untermann (2000) 446–8.

59 eram: cf. Call. fr. 100.1–2 Pfeiffer 'you were an uncrafted plank'. The contrast is between wood and bronze, not, as in Hor. *Sat.* 1.8.1 *olim truncus eram*, between unworked wood and the made Priapus. The first-person identity continuing across different statues aims to intrigue.

properanti falce dolatus contrasts with *caelator* (who engraves with a *caelum*) and *artifices*. The rough hewing is conceived to occur in the middle of another rustic activity; cf. Col. 10.29–34: not Greek art for your Priapus but a *truncum forte dolatum*. The scythe, Priapus' own emblem, provides another link to that god.

61–3 Mention of the artist, a common inscriptional element, is joined with another, gentleness from the earth to the dead (4.5.1n.); this is given a turn apt to the artist (he would fear damage to his hands rather than weight). Both elements are suitably closural. Relevant too is the end of the Sali's hymn (G. Dumézil, *Latomus* 10 (1951) 290–1). For all Mamurius' inclusion there he is dead, while the god lives on, in Rome; yet the man has created this passive god, *docilem*, for *tot . . . usus*. The poet too has created him; *tot* invites extension of meaning. (*tam dociles* (-is Ω) can hardly be 'transferred'; *usus* needs an adj.) Elegy's artistic refinement links the poet with Mamurius; cf. 2.34.43 *angusto uersus includere torno*, and 4.1.135 *finge elegos*.

64 unum contrasts with the many *ancilia* and many offerings; cf. Virg. *G.* 4.6 *in tenui labor, at tenuis non gloria* (of *Georgics* 4). The offerings have themselves been drawn into one poetic structure, as the neat ring with 1 confirms. *unum opus* extends too to the book, cf. 3.1.17 *opus hoc*, 4.1.67 *surgit opus* – and perhaps the series of P's books (cf. Ov. *Am. epigr.* 2).

4.3: ARETHUSA

The poem consists of a letter to a contemporary fictitious man, absent on campaign, from his wife Arethusa (A., in intro. and notes on this poem). The topic had already been handled by P. in 3.12; but there the husband is harangued by the male narrator. Here the poem is spoken, or rather written, by a woman throughout (the 'internal writer'). The external reader is highly conscious of the external writer, whose creation of female discourse would have seemed analogous to *prosopopoeia*, the orator or rhetorician's skillful creation of speech for a character (Intro. section 3 n. 23). Theon stresses that male and female language differ 'through nature' (p. 70 Patillon). But this genre adds further force.

Love-elegy as handled by P. had been written resolutely from the perspective of the male lover, whose love and jealousy had made the (constructed) beloved

woman an object of mystery; women's voices had seldom been heard at any length (see 4.7 intro.). Sympathy for women had been alleged (as in 3.12), and understanding – from outside, on the basis of experience in the course of love (cf. e.g. 1.12.11, 2.18a.1–2, 3.8.9–20 – the last shown as wishful thinking by the end of the poem). 4.3 offers a more direct, and detached, presentation of a female character. The external reader compares the earlier male narrator, who is in some ways more passive and feminized. The woman, though a wife not an elegiac *domina*, makes stern demands (see esp. 69–70), without the concessions of the previous Propertian narrator (e.g. 1.8a.17–18). She does not observe the compliance thought ideal by Roman husbands (cf. e.g. *CIL* VI 20116.5–6 (2nd cent. AD): two wives *mihi* . . . *obsequentissimis*); her toughness at the close (67–72) contrasts with the behaviour predicted of Galla in 3.12.19–22. She writes strongly, and the few softening gestures of concern are corrected into expressions of jealous anxiety (23–8, 63–9).

The image of the faithful woman waiting for her husband or lover is a recurrent one in ancient literature: so Penelope in the *Odyssey* (cf. P. 3.12.23–38), Deianira in Sophocles' *Trachiniae*, Metricha in Herodas 1, the sisters in Plautus' *Stichus*. The female's fixity of place and confinement of life is commonly set against the male's wanderings and danger. The conception is handled here with particular nuances and point.

It is brought out that A.'s access to Lycotas' world is always indirect: she cannot enter his camp (45), has not been 'seen' by distant lands (7–10); she must rely on books, maps or the like, and what she is told (27, 35–40). The male narrator is similarly remote from his more virile friend's travels in 1.6; but there is a stronger sense here of the woman having to create a whole male world from her mind. This parallels, but exceeds, the external writer's creation of *her* world. He presents the familiar world of the house, but invests it with richer physical detail than is common in elegy, and shows how A. 'sees' it emotionally – or depicts herself as seeing it. A.'s fundamental separation from Lycotas' world gives a new force to the opposition in love-elegy between love and war; but her criticism is complicated by at least a rhetorical effort to sympathize with intrinsically alien values.

A.'s situation is made less dissimilar from the situations typical of love-elegy than it might have been: in particular, there are no children. Her love is portrayed by her as ardent; the primary difference from the elegiac situations is that there exists a more momentous *foedus*. Marriage was often depicted as taking on the characteristics of passionate love, particularly when some separation or threat to the relationship was involved (cf. e.g. Cic. *Fam.* 14.2.2–3, *CIL* VI² 41062 II.42–56). Such threats and separations are a basic condition of elegiac love too – and generate the perpetual motion of its poetry-books.

The form used is that of a letter. Elegy here takes over another medium, and one strongly linked with a first person who is to be identified with the author. The form also has, at this stage, lively associations with the contemporary Roman world: Cicero's *Ad Familiares* (probably already published), Horace's recent verse

Epistles book 1. Here the letter, like elegy, makes a notable shift to a female first person. (It is most natural to see Ovid's *Heroides* as making a further shift, into mythological time; but one cannot actually prove P's priority, plausible as it seems.) The employment of writing here, rather than of undefined utterance, makes the external and rhetorically informed reader all the more keenly aware that this is meditated persuasion. Consequently, A.'s presentation of her feelings should be seen as aimed at moving the internal reader (Lycotas), and as her own purposeful construction of herself. This is not to say that it need be false or cannot be also an expression of her emotion; but the format invites critical and uncertain reading as well as sympathy.

The form of the poem is less meandering than is often thought; in any case, the complex and unpredictable movements of earlier Propertian elegy would make inferences about A.'s mind highly insecure. After (a) an epistolary introduction, stressing her misery and their separation, (b) 7–28 is principally focused on Lycotas' actions, (c) 29–62 on her own situation and love, (d) 62–72 on his actions. The articulation of the sections is strongly marked at 7, 29 and 62. The division into sections, and the greater size of (c), are natural in a letter; but here the division expresses the unsatisfactory position, and is complicated in significant ways. In (b) A.'s presentation of her retrospectively disastrous wedding presents Lycotas' deeds as a breach of their union: not mere absence. In (c) she depicts her spatial isolation from him, but shows how in mind and deed she is constantly engaged with him; in a flight of counter-factual fantasy her love leads her to envisage entering his world (43–8). In (d) his glory, return and reunion are made conditional on his fidelity to her. Thus she is bringing them together; his actions, past and present, push them apart ((a) and (b)). Only by his faithfulness continued into the future (so especially (d)) can the two people and worlds coalesce. (The triumph (68) and the dedication (72) blend the worlds.) The structure is powerfully persuasive. It also adumbrates a narrative, from wedding in (b) to possible reunion in (d): Lycotas, like the jury in a speech, has to choose the ending.

The contemporary associations of the poem are furthered by the content. The spread of Roman military activity, and the strenuousness of Augustus, made service in the provinces much more onerous. The question of leave was particularly pressing. We see in Livy 5.2–6 the presentation, from the viewpoint of this period, of a problem that was to grow (cf. 5.2.11). Suetonius, stressing Augustus' strictness, says *ne legatorum quidem cuiquam, nisi grauate hibernisque demum mensibus, permisit uxorem interuiscere* (Aug. 24.1). The mutinies in Pannonia and Germany after Augustus' death (Tac. *Ann.* 1.16–52) confirm that the conditions of service were a live issue.

However, the poem presents a somewhat less extreme situation than the plight of soldiers in the ranks with many years of unbroken service. Lycotas is most likely to be envisaged as an equestrian officer, who goes off on a series of separate campaigns, each on a kind of short-term contract (E. Birley, *Roman Britain and the Roman army* (Kendal 1953) 133–53; H. Devijver, *The equestrian officers of the Roman*

Imperial army II (Amsterdam 1992) 213–19; D. J. Breeze and B. Dobson, *Roman officers and frontiers* (Stuttgart 1993) 134, 188). The *hasta pura* in 68 lends support to the idea, but does not prove it (centurions too could receive this honour: V. A. Maxfield, *The military decorations of the Roman army* (London 1981) 186–7). On this hypothesis, it is in principle Lycotas' decision to keep returning to war. Questions on the marriage of ordinary soldiers would not then directly affect this poem (the legislation banning marriage is assigned to 13 BC by C. J. Wells, *AJAH* 14 (1989) 180–90; cf. S. E. Phang, *The marriage of Roman soldiers (13BC–AD235)* (Columbia Stud. in Class. Trad. 24, 2001)). The length of Lycotas' service so far is unclear; there is visible and significant inconsistency from A. (23–8n.).

The details of the campaigns are imaginary (7–10n.). The poem need not be dated to before 20, when the Parthians restored without bloodshed the standards lost by Crassus (cf. 3.4 and 5). The poets, at any rate, continued to imagine that Parthia might be conquered; the later expedition, which did at least reach Parthia (cf. 4.6.80–4n.), confirms that Parthian wars can remain a possibility for the fiction of this poem.

Some discussions: E. Reitzenstein, *Wirklichkeitsbild und Gefühlsentwicklung bei Properz* (*Philologus* Suppl. 29.2, 1936) ch. 2; P. Bernadini Marzolla, *Maia* 7 (1955) 163–83; H. Merklin, *Hermes* 96 (1968) 461–94; J. H. Dee, *TAPA* 104 (1974) 81–96; Hubbard (1974) 142–5; R. Maltby, *PLLS* 3 (1981) 243–7; P. E. Knox, edn. of Ovid, *Heroides* (Cambridge 1995) 17–18; Fox (1996) 158–60; G. Rosati, *Maia* 48 (1996) 139–55; Heyworth (1999) 71–80; B. Zimmermann, *MH* 57 (2000) 130–5; Janan (2001) ch. 3; Rambaux (2001) 284–5; Wyke (2002) 85–93.

1 The wholly unpredictable start makes the reader struggle for orientation. Elements of Roman epistolary greeting are joined with Greek names. It only becomes clear from 6 on that the setting is contemporary, and that the Greek names refer to upper-class Romans. P. has used Greek names for some Roman characters other than a mistress: Panthus (2.21), Demophoon (2.22a), Lynceus (2.34). Cf. Tibullus' Marathus and Pholoe, and e.g. Horace's Sybaris (*Odes* 1.8). In this poem elegant fiction seems more likely than pseudonyms: an imaginary letter from a real acquaintance to her real husband would seem an oddity and mean nothing to most readers.

Both names were used during the Empire and before, A. actually in Italy (e.g. *CIL* VI 21286, XI 3247). But P.'s other Greek names make one look for mythological connections, especially with the Syracusan spring Arethusa (this connection is perceived in the actual name, *CIL* VI 38705 suggests). An ironic contrast results: in a common version the Arcadian river Alpheius travels a huge distance under the sea, from love, to unite with her for ever (cf. e.g. Mosch. fr. 3 Gow; Virg. *Aen.* 3.694–6, Ov. *Am.* 3.6.29–30 . . . *Alpheon diuersis currere terris* . . . *certus adegit amor*, Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.203–8). A. and Lycotas have pastoral resonance: cf. for A. Theocr. 1.117, Virg. *Ecl.* 10.1 (*Lycoris* comes in 2); for Lycotas Theocr. 5.62 (*Lycopas*), Calp.

Sic. 6.26, 7 (Lycotas). The transference from pastoral to an urban setting plays on the themes of the book, where Rome changes from rustic to urban (cf. e.g. 4.4.3–6n.); it reverses the conversion of elegy into pastoral in *Eclogue* 10.

The form of the line clearly evokes the opening of real letters: cf. e.g. *CPL* 247.2 (21–18 BC), second letter 1–2 *P[]aconiu[s] Macedoni suo | salutem*. The *suo* probably implied, though practice varied, a distinctive affection or respect. Cicero rarely uses it save to members of the household; it is sometimes the subject of comment or wit in the correspondence (*Fam.* 7.29.1, 16.18.1). See also 71–2 n.

Haec (PT^{ms}): supplied by conjecture. Cf. e.g. *Ov. Ex P.* 4.14.1 *haec tibi mittuntur*.

mandata could simply suggest a message, even a written message, entrusted to someone to take (cf. e.g. Iphigenia's letter at *Ov. Ex P.* 3.2.91); but the idea of injunctions, and even 'last wishes', will be seen as the reader looks back. Cf. in *P.* 3.6.37 (message to Cynthia), 3.7.55 (prayer and last wish), 3.16.7 (order in letter from Cynthia), 4.7.71 (Cynthia's very last requests).

2 'If you can indeed be "mine" when you are away so often.' The shift to the first and second person adds force to the disruption of the formula in 1. A postponement of *si* seems more plausible in *P.* than making the *cum* clause precede but depend on the *si* clause (cf. Kenney on *Ov. Her.* 17.9–10). In any case, the order throws bitter emphasis on to the absences.

3–4 The idea of the writing blotted out by tears looks like a direct transformation of Cicero's opening in a letter to his wife from exile (*Fam.* 14.3.1): he has received letters from her, *quas ego lacrimis prope deleui*. Here the woman reappropriates and exploits the tears that were often regarded as a particularly feminine emotional weapon. Cf. e.g. 2.20.1–8, 3.25.5–6 (Cynthia), *Livy* 3.47.3 *comitatus muliebris plus tacito fletu quam ulla uox mouebat*. A. is affecting to apologize for the practical problem of illegibility (cf. *Cic. Q. fr.* 2.11.4–5); writing is stressed at the start. Ovid often takes up this passage, e.g. *Her.* 3.3, *Tr.* 1.1.13–14.

tamen is most easily seen as linking the *si* clause to the main clause of the preceding couplet, rather than as withdrawing from 2 (Heyworth (1999) 72).

lacrimis . . . litura: the alliteration binds together the emotive and the prosy word (*litura* perhaps first extant here in poetry; next *Hor. Epist.* 2.1.167, *AP* 293, *Ov. Her.* 3.3). The pairing highlights the unexpected development of the humdrum details of letter-writing.

5–6 create a dramatic or melodramatic climax to the first section. *iam* shows that *morientis* does not merely mean 'fainting'. The hand, on which attention is concentrated, is made to die itself as the person dies: this is a striking extension of phrases like *Ov. Met.* 5.84 *humum moribundo uertice pulsat*, cf. *Luc.* 4.560 *moriente manu*, *Sil.* 10.199.

tractu: cf. *OLD* s.v. 5b ('drawing or tracing of a line').

7–10 From a historical perspective, the sequence of places shows the immense spread of Roman arms from the days when it was difficult to conquer Veii (4.10.24) and it was a long way to Fidenae (4.1.36). The places chosen are not just characteristic scenes of military activity in the period, like Spain, Gaul or Germany. The

stress, especially in 9–10, is on remote extremes, which Augustus had not necessarily quite reached yet: cf. for Britain e.g. 2.27.5, Hor. *C.* 1.35.29–30, 3.5.3–4, Vell. 2.46.1 (*Julius alterum paene imperio nostro . . . quaerens orbem*); for India cf. P. 3.4.1 (cf. *ultima terra* 3), Hor. *C.* 4.14.42, *Saec.* 53–6, Virg. *Aen.* 6.794–5 *super et Garamantas et Indos | proferet imperium*, 7.603–6. The general notion of range is an important motif even in the less fanciful *Res Gestae* (India 31). The Getae, on the Danube, not always sharply distinguished from the Scythians, are presented here as extreme northerners (*hiberni*). (Cf. V. Lica, *The coming of Rome in the Dacian world* (Konstanz 2000) chs. 3–4.) For the Parthians, who often appear disguised as Persians or Medes, see Intro. section 2, 4.6.79–80n.; R. M. Schneider in J. Wieschöfer (ed.), *Das Partherreich und seine Zeugnisse* (*Historia Einzelschr.* 122, 1998) 95–147.

In this passage, unlike 3.4 and 5 or 3.12, there is no allusion to wealth or plunder as a discreditable motive for the wars. But the rhetoric that marks achievement from a male and historical perspective, from the female and personal viewpoint of the speaker provides a catalogue of delinquencies (cf. 2).

7–8 *Bactra per ortus* does not appear in N. Words, phrases, and lines that do not appear in N show signs of spuriousness with remarkable frequency (cf. the more hesitant discussion of H.-Chr. Günther, *Quaestiones Propertianae* (*Mnemosyne Suppl.* 169, 1997) 67–90); this ending is thus exposed to considerable suspicion (cf. for line-endings 2.34.53, 83, 3.1.27, 5.39, 4.8.71; cf. also esp. 3.9.35). Now, it is likely that 8 refers to the Parthians, whose mailed horses (*munito . . . equo*) were well-known (cf. 3.12.11; J. W. Eadie, *JRS* 57 (1967) 164). There seems no reason to think that the ancients were aware of Chinese mailed horses (*Sericus* 5). Persians or Medes were probably mentioned (*Persicus* Dousa Junior, cf. for the meaning of the adjective with *hostis* Ov. *Ex P.* 2.8.36 *Scythico . . . hoste*); but the name would not be used to mark a people and region distinct from the Parthians: cf. 3.9.25, 12.11, where the Medes mean ‘Parthians’. *Bactra*, however, is seen as part of the Parthian Empire (63–9, cf. 3.1.16, Luc. 8.298–9); Lycotas is fighting Parthians in both 8 and 66. This makes it hard to refer 7 and 8 to two distinct areas of campaign, as rhetoric and 9–10 make desirable. (18 provides little counter-argument: see 18n.)

63 would have made *Bactra* the obvious name to add. *iteratos . . . per ortus* (‘through the much-travelled East’) has rightly been found curious in this context. *Bactra*, and *ortus* in this sense, appear in Petrarch (*Afr.* 2.186, 8.160), who could even have devised the supplement. Originally *per annos*, for example, could have ended the line; or *iteratos* might be corrupt itself, at beginning or end, with no context to protect it (so, e.g., *iteratis* <*Seres in armis*>, cf. for *Seres* e.g. Hor. *C.* 1.12.55–6, 4.15.21–4).

9 picto . . . curru: cf. 2.1.76 *esseda caelatis siste Britanna iugis. picto* and *decolor* (10) make the extremes exotic.

10 ustus: Heyworth (1986) 206 argues that the colour of Indians could be attributed to the water they drank (but Mart. 7.30.4 is uncertain support). ‘Burned

by water' could be a bold Propertian paradox, but in combination with the repetitive or awkwardly proleptic *decolor* arouses suspicion. Other participles (like Housman's *tunsus*) continue to make the line unpleasantly crowded; perhaps some different kind of word, like say *uidit*, has been corrupted.

Eoa . . . aqua: probably the Indian Ocean. Cf. Murgatroyd on Tib. 2.2.15–16.

11 The subject-matter makes the rhetoric sound distinctively female: cf. e.g. Livy 3.48.8 (emphasized as female) *clamitant matronae eamne liberorum procreandorum condicionem, ea pudicitiae praemia esse?*, Ov. *Her.* 6.41–2 *heu, ubi pacta fides?* . . .

The text of the second half of the line cannot be recovered with any certainty. If *et* is right, the nominative noun must be capable, like *fides*, of relating to what precedes in an implicit negation (your absences are not . . .); the phrase must also connect satisfactorily to the *cum* clause in 12. Housman's *primae praemia noctis* answers well, cf. Livy 3.48.8 above; the bridal night could be the object of reward as it is of notional exchange at Call. fr. 75.44–8 Pfeiffer. Alternatively, *et* might be wrong, e.g. for *ubi* (Heinsius: 'where?') . . . *gaudia. pactae*, a common stem in relation to marriage arranged between families, is somewhat oddly combined with *noctis*. Changing *noctis* as in *pacta haec foedera nobis* (Watt) creates unwelcome word-order; with *pacta . . . cum* cutting across the rhetorical pair *haecne . . . fides et . . . haec foedera*; nor would the moment of physical surrender be the moment of the legal marriage *foedus* (cf. e.g. Luc. 2.352–3).

fides: cf. Intro. section 4, 4.1.79–80n. for this motif of the book. It is strikingly applied to the personal, but legal, context, which Lycotas' Roman activity is violating.

Military associations appear in *rudis* (an untrained recruit, cf. Ov. *Her.* 11.48 *et rudis ad partus et noua miles eram*), *urgenti* (of military forces, *OLD*s.v. 5a), *braccia . . . dedi* (a play on *manus dare*, to surrender) and *uicta*. The image of love-making as war has as often further point (e.g. 2.1.13–14, 3.5.1–2): here A. was another victim (though willing) of the soldier, and she has now been drawn into the consequences of real fighting, then new to her (cf. *rudis*). Particularly relevant here is the conjunction of bridal and literal fighting at Cat. 66.11–20 (based on Callimachus).

12 rudis urgenti: the juxtaposition suits the contact of the two bodies.

13–16 The ritual of marriage is perverted; death and the funeral taint it. The language draws on conventions where death is clearly involved: cf. e.g. Eur. *HF* 480–4 (with R. Seaford, *JHS* 107 (1987) 106–30); Cic. *Clu.* 14 *nubit . . . funestis ominibus omnium*, *CIL* 1² 1732.5–8 (1st cent. BC) 'I was happily married, but have now been given to Dis', *deducta et fatali igne et aqua Stygia*; Ov. *Met.* 6.426–34. In this context, as in Ovid's imitation at *Her.* 6.41–6, death is less plainly relevant; but A. wishes to insinuate a tragedy (cf. 6).

13 deductae: in the wedding procession to the bridegroom's house, cf. *TLL* s.v. 272.80–273.16. The participle does not precede *praetulit* in time; cf. K–S 1 757–60.

omen: cf. Pliny *NH* 16.75 *spina, nuptiarum facibus auspicatissima* (promises the best luck). *praetulit* would naturally be used with the torch as object (cf. *Ov. Her.* 6.46); here the torch holds an omen, embodied in itself.

14 sparsa: cf. *Fest.* p. 77 Lindsay *aqua aspergebatur noua nupta*.

15 lacu: used of underworld water including rivers, cf. *OLD* s.v. 1c.

16 uitta: brides' hair was elaborately dressed, probably with the help of ribbons (L. La Follette in Sebesta and Bonfante (1994) 56–7; A. T. Croom, *Roman clothing and fashion* (Stroud 2000) 110). For funereal ribbons cf. 3.6.30 *cinctaque funesto lanea uitta toro*, 4.11.34, *Ov. Ib.* 103 *ferales . . . uittas*, *Sen. Med.* 802–3.

deo: Hymen, invoked in the procession (cf. *Plaut. Cas.* 800, *Cat.* 62.5 etc.). He is depicted at an ordinary wedding on the sarcophagus St Petersburg, Ermit. A. 433 (c. AD 180), I. I. Saverkina, *Römische Sarkophage in der Ermitage* (Berlin 1979) 38–42, pls. 28, 30.

17 omnibus, heu: he has returned from every possible direction, so numerous have been his campaigns. For the present campaign one specific gate will, after his return, receive the offering (71–2).

mea pendent anxia (Guyet): it seems an involved and far-fetched thought that the offerings are actually harmful (*pendent mea noxia* Ω) because they have brought about Lycotas' safe return (and so encouraged him to leave again). Cf. Heyworth (1999) 73.

18 textitur: this traditional occupation of the faithful woman (33n.) can also indicate affection, cf. e.g. *Livy* 1.26.2 *paludamento sponsi quod ipsa confecerat*, *Hor. Epod.* 12.21–2; but here the dative is forcefully made *castris . . . tuis*, not *tibi*.

quarta would undercut the hyperbolic *omnibus* if taken to mean that there were only four campaigns. The list in 7–10 probably gave five enemies, and need not be exhaustive; soldiers' cloaks could be sent (cf. e.g. *Tab. Vind.* 255 (1st–2nd cent. AD), *CPL* 250.4–5 (2nd cent. AD)), so three returns are not implied.

lacerna: a detail from 3.12 is now given a fresh turn: 7 (the husband on campaign) *iniecta tectus, uesane, lacerna*.

19–22 The poetry proceeds from A.'s manufacture of cloaks for war to the beginnings of manufacturing other objects for war. A curse on the inventor of stakes and trumpets is a less obvious and more colourful equivalent to curses on the inventor of swords, or iron or war (cf. e.g. *Cat.* 66.48–50); it naturally involves a wish for his death. In Hades he is neatly imagined as weaving a rope endlessly consumed; this brings us back to A., and is an apt punishment for the endless succession of wars in history and her experience. Cf. 3.5.12 *armis nectimus arma noua*, *Soph. Aj.* 1197, *Livy* 2.18.10 *qui bella ex bellis severent*, 31.6.4, 13.4.

19 carpsit ab arbore uallum: a perverse fruit, as *immerita* emphasizes, and a reversal of rustic ease.

20 ossa tubas: this juxtaposition is forceful, like *arbore uallum*. The animal bones lead to thoughts of the human bones produced by war. The use of animal bones is more normally associated with the oboe (*Call. Hy.* 3.244–5, *Juba, FGrHist* 275 F 82 etc.).

21 dignior . . . qui torqueat 'worthier to weave', cf. *OLD* s.v. *dignus* 2a.

Ocno: abl. of comparison. Ocnus was punished in Hades for an uncertain crime (laziness: Pliny *NH* 35.137; none in Paus. 10.29.1–2); a donkey endlessly consumed the rope he made. Polygnotus' painting of the underworld included him (Paus. l.c.; Plut. *Tranq.* 473c), and he seems to have been used proverbially. See also *LIMC* vii 1.33–5. It seems unlikely that *obliquo* is sound. It would be strange for Ocnus to be described as sideways, with the donkey or rope as the point of reference (the donkey is addressed only later); and explicit reference to Polygnotus' painting, even if we were more certain of its design, would seem peculiar in this context. Another adjective might have been displaced (along the lines, say, of *dignior hic pigo*).

22 aselle: concentration on the hungry donkey adds to the almost Callimachean deviousness of perspective.

23–8 The tone in 23–4 is concerned and intimate; the topic evokes the concern of real letters with the addressee's health. The first appearance of tenderness, however, abruptly makes way for a fierce concern with Lycotas' fidelity. A. is tougher than the elegiac male lover who hopes that his mistress, in accompanying another lover on campaign, will not suffer from the cold or cut her *teneras* . . . *plantas* on the ice (Gallus, Virg. *Ecl.* 10.47–9; cf. for the topic P. 1.8a.7–8). She is also obsessively single-minded; the visual puns which lead her back to her obsession introduce a somewhat amusing note for the external reader. The probable source for 25–6 in Cicero confirms the element of humour: the corrupt Verres' body would display, not scars like those of the real military hero M'. Aquilius, but *ex mulierum morsu uestigia libidinis atque nequitiae* (Ver. 5.32, with perhaps a few words missing before *ex*). That passage also highlights the humour of the male soldier who would not be displaying the scars of long service (cf. e.g. Livy 6.14.6; M. Leigh, *BICS* 40 (1995) 195–212), but on the contrary would be finding the very equipment uncomfortable. Male and female behaviour in these lines is pleasingly confused (cf. e.g. Livy 5.6.4 *adeone effeminata corpora militum nostrorum* . . . ?); and the passage calls into question how seasoned a campaigner Lycotas really is (cf. *imbelles* 24). The alternative makes less sense: that he is actually seasoned and that the passage pretends he is raw.

23 urit 'hurts', *OLD* s.v. 10.

25 dentibus is effectively placed; but it is not the subject, like *lorica* or *hasta*: there is a conscious agent.

26 det mihi plorandas . . . notas: *dare* is to be taken primarily as 'give to you', so standard is it with kisses and the like (e.g. 1.16.42, 2.6.11, 4.5.39–40). *mihi* is then dependent on *plorandas*. But there is also heard the sense that the girl 'gives' A. the marks (*det mihi*), as if deliberately, to weep over (cf. e.g. Plaut. *As.* 676; Ov. *F.* 2.133 (*moenia tu dederas transilienda Remo*). For love-bites see Murgatroyd on Tib. 1.6.13–14; at P. 3.8.21 *mea uulnera* brings out their paradoxical violence.

27 sed opto: one expects the pentameter to continue 'that this report is false' (cf. e.g. *CPL* 251.3–4 (soldier, 2nd cent. AD) *ante omnia opto te bene [u]alere* . . .); but

A.'s concern is different. The lover's thinness is another standard idea, cf. e.g. *Ov. Met.* 11.793 *fecit amor maciem*; so too his pallor, which is here conflated with it. For them as a natural pair, cf. *Ov. AA* 1.729–38.

28 desiderio . . . meo 'longing for me', as absent (*OLD* s.v. *desiderium* 1a). Neither *desiderium* nor *desidero* is common in elegy, save Ovid's exile-poetry.

29 meo (28) leads on to *at mihi*, as A. turns to depict her own longing for Lycotas. She concentrates in this passage (29–42) on the night, the obvious time for love and infidelity.

amaras is emphasized by its position: epithets do not frequently end the hexameter in P., save for narratives in book 4. The bitter nights of elegiac male lovers are recalled: 1.1.33 *noctes . . . amaras* |, 2.17.3–4 *amaras* | . . . *noctes*, Tib. 2.4.11 *nunc et amara dies et noctis amarior umbra est*.

30 si qua relictia iacent: the poem depicts A.'s experience in general terms, not at this specific time or during this particular campaign.

osculator arma tua: a poignant gesture, intensified by the arresting collocation of *osculator* and *arma*. A. is kissing the cause of her woe. The ominous figure of Dido brings in the possibility of a change of heart (cf. 69–70) as well as death; cf. *Virg. Aen.* 4.495–8 (requests burning of) *arma uiri, thalamo quae fixa reliquit*, 646–7.

31–2 The experience of the male narrators of elegy, cf. e.g. 1.12.13–14 *longas . . . noctes*, *Am.* 1.2.1–2 . . . *neque in lecto pallia nostra sedent*; Crinag. *AP* 9.248 (*GP* 1733–6), where the narrator tosses to left and right in the bed empty of his mistress (cf. *toto*). *Ov. Tr.* 4.3.21–6 describe the restless nights of the enamoured wife (25 *nox immensa uidetur*).

lucis . . . auctores 'who vouch that dawn is coming', cf. *OLD* s.v. *auctor* 10.

33–42 A. dwells particularly on the winter nights. As it is dark earlier, the 'night' now includes the time for wifely tasks as well as sleep; and the winter is the time when, if at all, soldiers might be expected home (41–2). A. can thus display her wifely virtue and show the hardness of her lot.

33 castrensia pensa laboro 'I toil on the night's weaving for the camp' (*OLD* s.v. *laboro* 8a for the acc.). Making clothes is the archetypal activity of the good wife, Penelope, Lucretia (*Livy* 1.57.9), Claudia (*CIL* 1² 1211.8 *domum seruauit* (including the sense 'kept to'), *lanam fecit*), and of Cynthia, in her own presentation (1.3.41). But A. is actually helping Lycotas' resented work; the phrase *castrensia pensa* produces in this context a surprising combination.

34 This is purple wool from Tyre (cf. Tränkle on [Tib.] 3.8.15–16). *gladios* will not easily make an intelligible sentence, and either *suos* or *tuos* would be unsatisfactory. *suo* (Rossberg: I sew) would involve an odd procedure, and one outside the formulaic descriptions of poetry. *chlamydas* (Housman, Barber) . . . *tuas* (Lee) is rightly championed by Heyworth (1999) 74. *secta* is odd too; *lecta* (Heinsius), if the right change, would have to emphasize an especially fine choice for Lycotas.

35–40 A. describes geographical studies, which begin from practicality, and return there, but in the middle embrace wider interests. The expansion probably

derives from Crinag. *AP* 9.559 (*GP* 1955–60), where the narrator asks a geographer for a learned work to help him sail to Italy (cf. 40). The broader interests are apparent in 39, and so would not be removed by deleting 37–8 (proposed by Heyworth (1999) 74–5). A picture of the scholarly *puella* develops, in pointed defiance of 2.34.51–4 (girls not interested in philosophy); the reversion to what matters in love is an amusing movement like those in 25–8. Cf. also E. A. Hemelrijk, *Matrona docta* (London 1999). *conor* in 37 (Broekhuizen) seems a desirable alteration; A.'s love for Lycotas could hardly be seen to compel the extension of her studies.

35 Parthia appears for A. as a distant object, accessible only through study; but Lycotas is to conquer it. The river Araxes recalls both 3.12.8 (to be drunk by Postumus in Parthia) and Virg. *Aen.* 8.728 *pontem indignatus Araxes* (the climax of the epic vision of empire).

36 On Parthian cavalry cf. A. K. Goldsworthy, *The Roman army at war* (Oxford 1996) 60–8.

37 Perhaps *tabulis*: different maps and diagrams offer each their own world. The phrasing is deliberately whimsical. For *pictos* cf. Vitr. 8.2.6 (rivers) *orbe terrarum chorographiis picta. ediscere* is 'learn thoroughly'. It does not matter quite what sort of depiction is envisaged, nor is the passage evidence for such depictions in ordinary homes; the point is the surprising intellectualism, apparent even in 37. The place of maps in the Roman world beyond the world of scholarship is sceptically reviewed by K. Brodersen, *Terra cognita* (Hildesheim 1995); see earlier Cl. Nicolet, *Space, geography, and politics in the early Roman Empire* (Ann Arbor 1991) chs. 3 and 5.

38 'And what the nature is of the skillful god's arrangement [of the world] as we have it (*haec*).' The god recalls Plato's creating δημιουργός 'craftsman' (*Tim.* 28a6 etc.), in Cicero *ille fabricator huius tanti operis, artifex (huius mundi)* (*Tim.* 6), Ov. *Met.* 1.57, 79, Sen. *NQ* 5.18.5 *dispositor ille mundi deus (deus del. Michaelis)*; P. 3.5.26 (the god's *arte*).

39 *lenta* and *putris*, *gelu* and *aestu* contrast neatly. *lenta gelu* is somewhat surprising: frost too was supposed to make earth crumbling rather than thick and mud-like (cf. e.g. Col. 3.11.7 (earth already *modice resoluta*) *gelu nec minus aestiuus putrescere caloribus*). Conceivably it is an error for e.g. *dura*.

41–2 The scene of 33–40 is filled in, but with a scanty cast; the evenings are chaste and gloomy. *una* means 'only'. For a wife's sister talking with her at her home cf. e.g. Livy 6.34.6; at Plaut. *Stich.* 9 *sed hic, soror, adsidedum*, the sitting is for worried conversation about their absent husbands. Worried conversation with the nurse resembles Ov. *Her.* 19.33–56. The theme joins 40–2 satisfyingly together. The nurse takes up the idea of Lycotas' sailing back (40), allegedly delayed through winter weather, and the indication of season in 33. To insert 51–6 after 40 (Heyworth) would remove the link of 41–2 with 40, and with 33; 53 *rarisque . . . kalendis* shows that the presentation is now of the year more generally.

curis . . . pallida 'pale with anxiety', cf. e.g. 1.13.7 *pallescere curis* (though of love), Mart. 14.162.2 *non uenit ad duros pallida cura toros*. The nurse's colour betrays

that she suspects altered feeling in Lycotas rather than the practical reason she falsely swears to.

43 felix Hippolyte! The homely scene is suddenly interrupted by fluent mythologizing. The geographical section 35–40 leaves it intriguingly open whether the knowledge is part of A.'s characterization or a deliberate intrusion of the elegiac language; the latter becomes more evident in 4.4.39–42, 9.57–8. The outburst recalls particularly the male narrator at 2.6.23 *felix Admeti coniunx* . . . !; cf. also 2.32.43–4, 3.13.15 *felix Eois lex funeris una maritis* . . . ! The elaboration that follows makes the *felix* sound paradoxical (cf. 2.6.23). The lines suggest, however, the Amazon queen's good fortune (if it was good) in securing the love of Theseus, who abducted or married her (she is seen in action against Theseus e.g. on the Attic red-figure lekythos Boston 95.48, 440–410 BC). *nuda* . . . *papilla* 'with bare breast' suits the warrior Amazon, cf. Virg. *Aen.* 11.648–9 *Amazon* (Camilla, figuratively), | *unum exserta latus pugnae*, and e.g. the Roman painting Brit. Mus. 61 (R. P. Hinks, *Catalogue of the Greek, Etruscan and Roman paintings in the British Museum* (London 1933) 40). The phrase also brings in the more extreme idea that an Amazon only has one breast (ἑμὸς ζών) for ease in fighting (Hellan. fr. 107 Fowler etc.). The couplet evokes the quite different perspective of the male poet on female nakedness in manly pursuits (3.14, esp. 13–14 *Amazonidum nudatis bellica mammis* . . . *turba*; 19 (Helen) *nudis capere arma papillis*). Softness, gender and war are unexpectedly combined; *molle*, literally of Hippolyte's hair, marks the generic resonance of the complex (see 4.2.23–4n.).

44 barbara contrasts with *Romanis* (45).

45 Romanis . . . puellis: in elegy (unlike e.g. Ovid's *Metamorphoses*) *puella* can include married or mature females (P. 2.3.36, 18b.17, 3.12.31, Ov. *Her.* 1.3, 4.2, *Ad* 1.54). However, the phrase generates some irony, at least for the external reader: *local* girls could have found their way into Roman camps (cf. Phang (intro. to poem), 124–9, 229–61). It also contrasts with the male narrator's use of the phrase at 2.3.29, 30, 28.55: his emphasis is on matching Greek heroines in beauty.

patuissent: there is little difference here between the plup. and impf. subjunctive (*essem* 46). Cf. 4.9.43–4n.

castra heightens the contrast with *barbara*; cf. Livy 31.34.8: Philip V says no one could think such orderly camps those of barbarians.

46 sarcina, the Roman soldier's pack of equipment, is effectively kept for the start of the half-line; it conveys abject devotion through a prosy word and a startling metaphor: person and pack are fused (cf. *fida*). The word advances on, and differs from, the *castrensia pensa* (33) worked at a distance: A. would become a physical part of Lycotas' military world. It is a self-consciously touching moment. *sarcina* had been used in poetry, but in unelevated contexts (Cat. 28.2 *sarcinulis* (military), [Virg.] *Cat.* 10.16, Hor. *Epist.* 1.13.6). Ovid, who employs it quite often, draws on this passage (cf. e.g. *Her.* 3.68 (Briseis) *non ego sum classi sarcina magna tuae. militiae* is probably dative ('for your campaigning').

47–8 The inconstant sensuality of elegiac mistresses can cause them to tread the snow in distant parts (1.8a.7–8, Virg. *Ecl.* 10.22–3, 46–9); here ardent devotion is seen from a female perspective. Cf. Sen. *Phaed.* 233–5 (Phaedra would follow Hippolytus through snow and mountains), 613–14.

nec . . . tardarent ‘would not hinder’, cf. *OLD* s.v. *tardo* 1a.

†**affricus**† . . . **nectit**: Morgan’s *uertit* is an easy change, and may be right (CQ36 (1986) 195–7). Yet *nectit* seems apt: cf. e.g. Lucr. 6.878 *exsoluit glaciem nodosque relaxat*. The objection that one does not elsewhere in Latin bind *x* into (so as to produce) *y* ignores the point that only the ‘binding’ of water produces such a transformation; and here the subject helps to personify the process. The use of *in* is natural enough in poetry as ‘so as to produce’; cf. e.g. Virg. *G.* 1.169–70 *domatur | in burim . . . ulmus*, 508 *falces conflantur in ense*. P. uses *in* + acc. quite freely; cf. e.g. 2.22a.21 *exiles uideor tenuatus in artus*, 4.6.29–30. For *affricus*, *astrectam* does not seem an ideal replacement, either with *uertit* or with *nectit* (cf. A. Allen, *Hermes* 117 (1989) 482–3).

49–52 49–50 are not naturally followed by *nam* in 51. It would be too obscure to say ‘married love is strongest, for what point would there be in my wearing finery [sc. so as to attract lovers]?’ (Cf. R. Maltby, *PLLS* 3 (1981) 245–6.) The rhetorical question is particularly strange. If the lines were removed (del. W. C. Helmbold, *Univ. Cal. Publ. Cl. Phil.* 13 (1949) 398–9), the connection of 47–8 to 51–2 would work very well. Better cold and discomfort with Lycotas than luxury at home. There is no convincing place for 49–50 elsewhere; generalizing and edifying remarks are a common kind of interpolation. The assertion *omnis amor magnus* is curious. *aperto* (publicly known) could be thought irrelevant; but if it is replaced by e.g. *raptō* (Hoeufft), *coniuge* seems an unwanted complication of the argument. *Venus . . . uentilat . . . facem* would come, if the lines are spurious, from Ov. *Am.* 1.1.8 (what if Minerva) *uentilet . . . (Venus) faces?* The direction of these assertions at the husband himself detracts from the persuasive energy of the poem.

51 quo ‘to what purpose’, cf. 2.13.45 *nam quo tam dubiae seruatur spiritus horae?* A. depicts as pointless what would seem in itself a much more appealing situation for the women of love-elegy (luxury and the enhancement of her beauty). The stance is like that of the wife in Com. Adesp. 1000.19–23 K–A ‘. . . where is there so much money as to give me more joy than my husband?’, cf. Plaut. *Stich.* 132–6; conversely Eur. *El.* 1068–75, P. 1.15.1–8 (adornment during the husband’s absence or the narrator’s trouble). The man takes a similar line to A. on luxury in 1.14, but ornaments and rich clothing are more intimately related to the woman’s body and beauty (cf. *CIL* v² 41062 II.1–3).

†**te**†: if 49–50 are deleted, *hic* (Hutchinson) makes a stronger contrast with 45–8 than *nunc* (Housman 252–3; it would now be ‘as it is’, though far from initial position). *hic* is also closer to N’s *te*. ΠΛ’s *tibi* would be either a corruption of *hic* or an alteration of *te*.

52 For crystal set in a ring cf. e.g. the Augustan rings Bonn O.12735, 12691, B. Deppert-Lippitz, *Goldschmutz der Römerzeit im römisch-germanischen Zentralmuseum* (Bonn 1985) 27 nos. 99, 100, pl. 41. *aquosa* (with the clarity and purity of water) conveys the attraction of what is spurned.

53 *omnia* conjures up impressionistically a scene of silence throughout the house. Cf. *omnia* in the household scenes at Ov. *Her.* 8.75–6, *F.* 4.537; Livy 4.39.9 *uasta desertaque omnia. surda* is ‘not heard, silent’, cf. 4.5.58n.

53–4 *rarisque assueta kalendis* | *uix aperit clausos una puella lares* ‘scarcely a single girl opens up (i.e. causes to be opened by coming to visit) the closed house on the Kalends of occasional months’ (so E. Reitzenstein (intro. to poem) 28). For *lares* cf. 4.1.128, 8.50. It is reasonable to suppose that Kalends, Ides and Nones were days for meetings and parties: cf. esp. Cato *Agr.* 143.2, Pompon. 85 Ribbeck <domi> | *si kalendis conuiuantur, idibus cenant foris* (<d.> | *si Hutchinson: conuiuant <d.>* Dübner), Mart. 4.66.3 *raris togula est excussa kalendis*. A. has hardly any visitors, even women (for *puella* cf. 45n.); Roman women often visited each other, cf. e.g. *Tab. Vind.* 291 (1st–2nd cent. AD) (even in Athens cf. e.g. Ar. *Ecll.* 348–9). Rare sacrifices to the Lares would not accord well with 57–62, or yield an argumentative point. Nor would ‘scarcely . . . one slave’ serve a clear purpose. ‘The occasional 1 March’ (*Martisque* Markland, of the Matronalia) would demand too large a time-scale. *assueta* is strange (cf. Heyworth (1999) 79); ‘the girl who usually did this before’ hardly fits with *uix* or *una*, and ‘the girl who usually does this now’ does not fit with *raris*. *adducta* (Heyworth) does not perhaps convey the sense ‘invited’ very clearly; and ‘invited’ does not assist the argument. *insueta* (Hutchinson; *desueta* ‘grown unaccustomed’ Baehrens) would reinforce *rarisque*.

55–6 The absence of human company in the empty house (cf. 53–4) is stressed by mention of the dog; the isolated *uox* is set against *omnia surda tacent*. The lines should not, then, be transposed after 32 (Housman); if they were, *querentis*, moaning to be allowed on to the bed, would not fit well after 32 (late on in the night). *una* suggests the claim is granted. Both external and internal reader are to be charmed by the domestic vignette. For dogs sleeping on the owner’s bed cf. Plaut. *Cur.* 691–2, *CIL* XIII 488.2–3 (2nd–3rd cent. AD; *ML* no. 204). For pet dogs cf. Citroni on Mart. 1.109; *AE* 1994 nos. 348 (*festiuae . . . catellae*) and 699.

Craugidos: cf. Xen. *Cyn.* 7.5 Κραυγή, E. Bäcker, *De canum nominibus Graecis* (diss. Königsberg 1884) 48–50. The name (‘shout’), like many Greek dog-names, suggests a fierce hunter; it contrasts nicely with the puppy’s whimper.

grata querentis: a paradox. The female dog is for the external reader a miniature version of the human A.; its vocal laments contrast with her written laments.

tui partem . . . tori ‘a share in your bed’, rather than *tuam . . . tori* (Guyet) or *tori . . . tuam* (Heyworth). *uindicat* implies a claim as of right, cf. *CIL* XIII 488.5–6 *latrares modo si quis adcubaret* | *riualis dominae licentiosa* (another dog, but playing on

humans as here). The dog would think itself entitled to a share rather than the husband's half of the bed; *pars* 'a share' is very common with *uindico*, cf. e.g. Cic. *Off.* 1.22 *ortusque nostri partem patria uindicat*, Pliny *Ep.* 6.32.2, *Dig.* 5.2.11 *pr.*, 32.41 *pr. ne ex fundo Titiano partem tibi uindices. tui* implies possession on a level which does not exclude Craugis' sleeping there.

57–8 The wife's offerings all around the city (cf. 17) show her desire for her husband's return, as well as her laudable piety (cf. Cic. *Fam.* 14.7.1 for praise of an assiduously pious wife).

The *compitum*, a cross-roads with an altar or the like and a cult for its *uicus*, is seen now in the contemporary city; cf. 4.1.23. On *compita* before Augustus' reforms in c. 7 BC, cf. J. B. Lott, *The neighborhoods of Augustan Rome* (Cambridge 2004), esp. 73–80. *ueteres* and *herba Sabina* make connection with the past; *herba Sabina* (the shrub 'savin'), besides its name, continues the simple rituals of old: cf. Ov. *F.* 1.343–4, *Culex* 404. For burning it, and for the crackling in the flames, cf. Ov. *F.* 4.741–2.

uerbenis: fragrant branches, used in ritual. See *OLD* s.v. 1a.

59–60 An omen good or bad will promptly produce an appropriate sacrifice from A. (61–2). The owl's cry (*gemitu* Pliny *NH* 10.34) is an omen of death: cf. 2.28.38, Virg. *Aen.* 4.462–3 (the owl on the *culminibus*, cf. *finitimo* . . . *tigno* 'a nearby roof-beam'), with Pease on 462. It is especially sinister when seen in cities (Pliny *NH* 10.34–5). At Ov. *Her.* 19.151–4 the sputtering of the lamp gives *prospera signa*; wine is then poured on it. The personified lamp (cf. *uoluit*) is seen as a frugal drinker (*parca*): it only requires a few drops. Cf. Man. 5.244–5 *nec parce uina . . . hauriet*, Mart. 13.116.2 *parca sitis*, Suet. *Jul.* 53 *uini parcissimum*.

61–2 The offering is more substantial than in 57–8: the omens make A. go further than plants. The language is lively. The picture of the attendants who kill the animals (*popae*) is satirical. The Callimachean interest in the victims' perspective (fr. 75.10–11 Pfeiffer) is developed in humorously portentous terms: so *denuntiat*, and the day as subject (cf. e.g. Cic. *Phil.* 6.2 *si ille dies uitae finem mihi adlaturus esset*).

hornis 'born this year'; cf. N–R on Hor. *C.* 3.23.3–4. It is set next to *dies*, and signals the brevity of their lives; cf. Hor. *C.* 3.13.3–8.

popae are supposed to get fat on their portion of the sacrifice (cf. Pers. 6.74 *ast illi tremat omento popa uenter*). *lucra* may, then, refer to the gain of the food (cf. e.g. *lucro* at Lucr. 5.875), rather than to the profit of selling that portion. For such portions cf. Fr. Puttkammer, *Quo modo Graeci uictimarum carnes distribuerint* (diss. Königsberg 1912) 31–5, Diggle on Theophr. *Char.* 22.4. For *succincti* cf. Luc. 1.612 *succincti* . . . *ministri*, Suet. *Cal.* 32.3; for *calent ad* 'hotly desire' Caes. *Gal.* 6.34.7 *animi ad ulciscendum ardent*.

63–70 63–8 elaborately lead up to the demand for fidelity. 67–8 make Lycotas' winning of a military honour (the *hasta pura*) conditional on his loyalty, in the idiom whereby a command is preceded by a wish with *sic* (may this happen if and only if you do what I ask: 67n.). That conditional wish for the honour is itself preceded by a contrasting and anxious request (63–6) that he may not in fact be keen enough

to gain the decoration, since this will involve great danger. 'Please do not care for such an honour; but none the less, I wish that you may get it, *if* you remain faithful.' The sequence produces a movement from concern for his welfare to grim insistence on his chastity (cf. 70). The long build-up gives 69 great force. Only this view of the passage makes sense of *sed* in 67; it also fits together the contrasting attitudes of 63–4 and 68–9. Usually *tua* . . . *equos* in 67–8 are put in brackets, and *sed* is made to relate 67 to 63–6.

63 ne . . . tanti sit 'do not think it is worth it'. The adverse price of danger is implied in 65–6, but not spelled out. For such inexplicit uses of the idiom cf. Cic. *Cael.* 36 *non putat tua dona esse tanti*, Ov. *AA* 3.610 *ne tanti noctes non putet esse tuas*, *F* 6.701 *ars mihi non tanti est*.

ascensis . . . Bactris 'when the city of Bactra has been scaled'. A better relation with *raptae* . . . *lina duci* (64) would perhaps be obtained by *ascensi* . . . *gloria Bactri* (Hutchinson), 'the glory of scaling Bactra'. Cf. for the construction 3.12.3 *tantine ulla fuit spoliati gloria Parthi* . . .?, Livy 25.29.5 *gloria captae nobilissimae* . . . *urbis*, Sil. 15.586–7 *gloria* . . . *urbis deletae*; for *Bactrum* Pliny *NH* 6.48.

64 This is like despoiling an enemy general of his armour, save that the Oriental does not wear armour. Cf. the Parthians in Roman art (Schneider in 7–10n.), and e.g. Val. Fl. 6.221–7 (*tenuia* . . . *candentis carbasa lini* 225), 691–709 (Parthian, with perfumed hair). An act with affinities to gaining the *spolia opima* (4.10) does not seem too real a worry from an unwarlike young man (24).

carbasa lina 'linen garments of cotton (?)'. *carbasus* (4.4.53–4n.) is used only here as an adj.

65 An alarming evocation of warfare, seen through the eyes of the anxious woman, not an epic narrator. *-umb-* *-unt-* *-ond-* *-und-* give suitable heaviness to the sound. *pondera* is used with the genitive of the containing object (the sling) that it weighs down, as in 4.1.100, 6.55. Cf. for the language e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 7.686–7 *pars maxima glandes* | *liuentis plumbi spargit*, Ov. *Met.* 14.825–6.

66 The standard notion of the Parthians pretending to flee and turning on the horse to shoot (cf. e.g. 2.10.13–14, Ov. *AA* 1.209–12; N–H on Hor. *C.* 1.19.12) is invigorated by the verb *inrepat*, and the application of *subdolus* to the bow not the archer.

67 sic 'on this condition'; see 63–8n. Cf. e.g. 1.21.5–6 *sic te seruato possint gaudere parentes*: | *haec soror* . . . *sentiat* (i.e. go and tell her); Cat. 17.5–7 *sic* . . . : | *munus hoc mihi* . . . *da* . . . ; Virg. *Ecl.* 9.30–2 *sic* . . . , | *sic* . . . : | *incipe*. The nationalistic Roman dream of conquering Parthia completely appears in A.'s writing only as something which Lycotas will want, and which she has misgivings about for her private reasons. A speaking or singing male poet will present the theme more patriotically (4.6.79–84).

68 Lycotas would obtain the distinguished award of the *hasta pura* (a headless spear; cf. V. A. Maxfield, *The military decorations of the Roman army* (London 1981) 84–6). He would carry his decoration in the general's triumphal procession. Cf. Livy 39.7.3 *multi* . . . *donati militaribus donis currum secuti sunt*, 45.38.12, Val. Max.

3.2.24. For *triumphantes* . . . *equos* cf. Ov. *Ex P.* 2.8.40; they are not his own (thus Goold).

69 foedera is a word with both marital and amatory associations: cf. e.g. 2.9.35 (love), 3.20.15–30 (love mingled with marriage; *lectus* 21), 4.7.21–2 (love), Virg. *Aen.* 4.339 (marriage), 520 (love), Hor. *C.* 3.24.22–3 (marriage), Tib. 1.5.7 *furtivi foedera lecti*, Ov. *Met.* 7.403 *thalami. incorrupta* increases the emphasis on physical chastity; contrast *si . . . iniunctum foedus servaretur* at Livy 41.23.5. There may be a play with *pura* 68: may Lycotas only get the *hasta pura* if he keeps their bed pure. The simple *mei* makes a strong claim to possession and rights.

70 hac . . . lege ‘on this condition’, cf. e.g. Cic. *Sest.* 24 *ea lege, si . . .* (within a figurative *foedus*); Livy 23.33.4 *foedusque cum eo atque amicitiam iungit his legibus: ut . . .*; OLD s.v. *lex* 12c. Legality is now pushed into a stark declaration, which provokes questions about the nature of A.’s love. The effect is like that of Isabella’s concise pronouncement (Shakespeare, *Meas.* II.4 *fn.*): ‘Then *Isabell* liue chaste, and brother die; | More then our Brother, is our Chastitie.’

71–2 are also conditional on Lycotas’ returning chaste; cf. Hypsipyle’s reluctance to pay her votive offerings now that Jason is safe but faithless (Ov. *Her.* 6.73–8). The condition modifies the apparent air of optimism.

The final act of writing in the poem mingles public and private, letter and inscription. It also creates a kind of *aition* for an object, and signals the complicated relationship of elegy and epigram (cf. Intro. section 3). Here a short inscription, less than a line, ends the poem and contrasts with its expansiveness. Cf. e.g. 2.14.27–8 (near end of poem; marked as *carmen*), Tib. 1.9.83–4 (end), Ov. *Am.* 1.11.27–8 (near end; cf. play on brevity at 23–4), *Tr.* 3.3.73–6 (near end; cf. play on brevity and length at 85–8). Printing such inscriptions in capitals, as is the usual practice, artificially exaggerates the difference of inscriptions from other kinds of writing.

armaque: arms of Lycotas, kept and kissed (30), would now be taken away in a joyful action. The first two words of the *Aeneid* enclose the couplet, with a force that is far from national, martial or epic.

portae . . . Capenae: the gate, at the start of the Via Appia, was held an ancient part of the city (*LTUR* III 325, *MAR* 193; mentioned already at Livy 1.26.2). There is a particular link, however, with a recent event: the senate consecrated an altar of *Fortuna Redux* there on Augustus’ return from the east in 19 BC, and instituted a large annual sacrifice (Aug. *RG* 11; *RIC* 1² Aug. 53–6, 322; *LTUR* I 275, *MAR* 138–9). Though A.’s dedication is on public view, there is a contrast between the senate’s dedication for the returning *princeps* and the quiet and anonymous dedication of the individual, for whom state matters are only a source of anxiety.

saluo points to the normal ways of opening and closing a Roman letter, . . . *salutem* and *uale*. But there is no unconditional wish here (cf. 27–8), and *salutem* was omitted from the opening. The external reader will also contrast Galla’s unconditional welcome of her husband when he returns *saluum* (3.12.21–2). *saluus*

cannot necessarily be used to mean 'chaste' of a man as of a woman (2.9.3, *Ov. Her.* 16.162; cf. Heyworth (1999) 80).

puella uiro: there are no names (contrast the opening), or even indications of origin. The phrase does not emphasize marriage: cf. e.g. 3.3.20 *quem legat exspectans sola puella uirum*.

4.4: TARPEIA

Here P. treats the story of Tarpeia (T.), who betrayed the Capitol to the Sabines during their war with Romulus, and was then killed by them. The story will go back to at least the third century BC (Antigonus *FGrHist* 816 F 2, cf. Dorandi's edn, (Paris 1999) xxvi–xxxii). For early Roman historians it raised questions of morality, and of the likeliest version (Fab. Pict. fr. 10 Chassignet, Cinc. Al. fr. 7 Chassignet, Calp. Piso fr. 11 Forsythe; see G. Forsythe, *The historian L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi and the annalistic tradition* (Lanham 1994) 150–7). Artistic depictions of the first century BC, probably going back to a monumental original, show current interest in the story, not least its Sabine elements and the violence of Tarpeia's death. See *RRC* no. 344/2 (89 BC), *RIC* 1st Aug. 299 (c. 19 BC), frieze of Basilica Pauli in the Forum (G. Carettoni, *Riv. Ist. Arch.* n.s. 10 (1961) 5–65; N. Kampen, *Klio* 73 (1991) 448–58; J. Evans, *The art of persuasion* (Ann Arbor 1992) ch. 7; *LTUR* 1 183–7; D. Arya in A. Carandini, R. Cappelli (edd.), *Roma: Romulo e Remo e la fondazione della città* (Milan, 2000), 303–19; T. P. Wiseman, *The myths of Rome* (Exeter 2004) 144–6).

To modern readers the story is myth; Romans were more inclined to see a core of plausible history. P. 4.6 and 4.7 move further than 4.4 from the familiar world. The betrayal of a citadel is a common historical event. The element that Livy himself segregates as a *fabula* (1.11.8) is the idea that T., greedy for the golden arm-bands of the Sabines, asked as a reward for what was in or on their left hands; they piled their shields on top of her. (This must have a Greek not a Latin origin: in Greek as in Russian the same word means 'hand' and 'arm'.) P. substitutes for this motive of greed the motive of love: love for Tatius the enemy commander, who agrees to marry her, and then has her killed with *arma* heaped upon her. This is not the usual version, though used by the Greek elegist Simylus (earlier than Plutarch; cf. *SH* 724 with n.); he, however, sets the story centuries later, with Gauls for Sabines.

The distinctive element of love has various connotations. In itself it would not be alien even to Livian narrative on the capture of cities (cf. esp. 27.15.9–12). Love for the enemy commander links the tale with various Greek 'myths': that of Scylla (originally too a tale of greed), and several stories recounted by Parthenius. Among relevant models will have been treatments of Scylla, probably or possibly including those of: Callimachus (fr. 63 Massimilla?); Parthenius (fr. 24 Lightfoot; probably poetry); the *Ciris* (1st cent. BC?). Important too are the Hellenistic poets who will have treated many of Parthenius' stories and others like them (cf. Euphor. *SH* 415 ii. 14–19; *SH* 964.11–12): so Hermesianax fr. 6 Powell and especially A.R.

fr. 12 Powell, on Peisidice in love with Achilles. Also significant is Apollonius' Medea, who helps the enemy Jason for love, and has plentiful monologues. (For her connection with these stories cf. F. Graf in J. J. Clauss and S. I. Johnston (edd.), *Medea* (Princeton 1997) 23–5; for A.R. fr. 12 cf. E. Sistakou, *Η ἄρνηση του έρωτος* (Athens 2004) 226–31.)

P's use of love complicates both the book and the poem. The reader must negotiate the intricate layering with which T. is treated. On an obvious level, her guilt is clear. P. makes her a Vestal Virgin, despite common views on the date of the first Vestal Virgins; he follows Varro, *LL* 5.41 *hic mons* (Capitol) *ante Tarpeius dictus a uirgine Vestale Tarpeia, quae ibi ab Sabinis necata armis et sepulta*. It is a dominating theme of the poem that T. wishes to marry the enemy. This is bad enough in Peisidice, but for a Vestal Virgin it is the most wicked and extraordinary of intentions. (Sen. Rh. *Con.* 6.8 present declamations on a Vestal who has written a line in praise of marriage; more on Vestals: M. Beard, *JRS* 70 (1980) 12–27; Beard, North and Price (1998) 153; A. Staples, *From Good Goddess to virgins* (London 1998) pt. 4; M. C. Martini, *Le vestali* (Brussels 2004)).

Marriage, characteristically in P. a respectable institution, in 4.4 unlike 4.3 and 4.11 signals the most shocking of all the book's women. Her death becomes a symbolic burying alive of the unchaste Vestal (91–2). The narrator's tone is formally condemnatory (1, 30, 87–94); this accords with the narrator's stance on Scylla at 3.19.21–8. The gods, within the narrative, are presented as damning T. too (69–70, 85–6). The narrator enjoys by literary convention, the gods by religious convention, a hierarchical superiority which gives them authority. T. acknowledges her own guilt too (36?, 43–4).

Undoubtedly the stern and bracing appearance of the poem forms part of its impact and challenge. And yet the antitheses of love and public duty seen throughout P., and notably in 4.3, make the reader wonder about other possibilities. The self-defensive and ostensibly misogynistic speaker of 3.19 is no straightforward authority. Even the most heinous sinners can be partly redeemed through literary treatment, like Euripides' child-killer Medea or the female war-criminal and lover of B. Schlink's *Der Vorleser* (Zurich 1995). The narrator of the *Ciris* has much sympathy with his heroine (e.g. 188–90). T. is assigned the longest single section in the poem for her speech, 31–66; the monologue is often a device for sympathetic exploration, and in this context has connections with love-poems, or the inset speech of 'Propertius' excluded at night in 1.16. The poem generally is focused on T. without interruption from 15 to 72, 46 lines (excluding 17–18) out of perhaps 92. It might be thought that we are being shown her point of view.

But even to allow a character to speak, and to show things from her perspective, is not necessarily to accept her outlook as valid; ancient readers are used to judging speeches critically. The monologue has a complex impact. The treatment of T.'s falling in love (21–2) and her own abject wishes (31–4) and distress at her guilt (45–6) clearly engage the reader's sympathy; but the speech has a dynamic movement to bold treachery and wildly assured fantasy. We could then see the poem (not the

narrator) as developing so that sympathy diminishes and disapprobation grows. The final narrative portion provides an apparently decisive verdict from many sources; the virginal Vesta (69–70) is succeeded by males, Jupiter, Tatius, the narrator, who all heap up condemnation in deed or word no less overwhelming than the arms of the Sabines.

However, the morality of the final section is so stark, the inequality of the match between T. and her opponents so extreme, that we are drawn to question the onward movement of the poem, in the light of P.'s other poetry, other interpretations of these events (not concealed from our attention) and the terrifying fierceness and brutality of Tatius. There is further significance to the two interacting structures of the poem: a gradual movement against T., and a female monologue enclosed within a male narrative. A level emerges more subtle than either satisfied endorsement of the narrator's morality or ardent participation in T.'s passion. The poem contemplates error and the lover's mind. For all the narrator's postures, the poem is interested in T.'s seeing: her initial sight of Tatius, already shaped by her cultural conceptions, is followed by a whole elaborate development of vision and imagination as her fantasies build up. The interpretation of the man she can only see and not know provides a counterpart to Arethusa, whose real husband cannot be seen. The mental workings of both are explored absorbingly. There is a tragic side to this concern with delusion: tragic irony, revelation and violence. A certain more light-hearted detachment is also visible, created by the poet's wit and sense of humour. Thus neither moral outrage nor tragic compassion seems a wholly suitable or complete reaction to T.'s suggestion of revenge for the Rape of the Sabine Women (57–8); her excuses for going out (23–4) put us in comic more than tragic territory.

Intricacy also attends the treatment of history and period. The figures of Romulus and Tatius, considered by T. for their appeal as men, form from other angles of the book vital figures in the earliest history of Rome, now embroiled in its most significant early war (Romulus and Tatius 4.1.9–10, 29–32 (this war 29), 37–8, 49–50, 55–6; 2.49–52, 59–60; 6.43–4, 80; 10.5–22). This war is to be contrasted with the campaigns of 4.3 and 4.6. We are also shown Roman life at this early stage. The depictions which are subsidiary to the main narrative at 3–6, 9–14, 73–8 emphatically reflect the larger interests of the book. The poem becomes more complex as it proceeds. At first we see the clear opposition found in 4.1, of simple past against cosmopolitan present. The unlawful passion of T. of course spoils generalizations about the moral past and immoral present, particularly after 4.3. More intriguingly, though, we already see the appeal of the exotic, and of attractive material objects. Unexpectedly it is a Sabine, in his armour, who possesses this appeal (see 32n.). An inevitable corollary is the relativity of luxury (note 3.13.25–34): anything unusual and above the subject's own standard of living will possess the same allure. The description of the Parilia infringes the opposition differently: this pastoral crudity remains now. The antitheses of the book are smudged.

Some discussions: P. Grimal, *REL* 29 (1951) 201–14; H. C. Rutledge, *CJ* 60 (1964–5) 70–3; K. Wellesley, *Acta Classica Univ. Scient. Debreceniensis* 5 (1969) 93–103; Marr (1970) 167–73; P. Pinotti, *GIF* 26 (1974), 18–32; J. Warden, *Hermes* 106 (1978) 177–87; F. Brenk in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin literature and Roman history* 1 (Brussels 1979) 166–74; T. J. R. Walsh, *LCM* 8.5 (1983) 75–6; Stahl (1985) 279–304; L. Beltrami in G. Catanzaro and F. Santucci (edd.), *Tredici secoli di elegia latina* (Assisi 1989) 267–72; R. King, *CJ* 85 (1989–90) 225–46; K. N. O'Neill, *Hermathena* 158 (1995) 53–60; Fox (1996) 160–5; P. A. Miller and C. Platter *CW* 92 (1998–9) 445–54; Heyworth (1999) 80–6; Janan (2001) ch. 4; Rambaux (2001) 286–9; Wyke (2002) 93–9; Miller (2004) 189–203; DeBrohun (2003) 146–9, 192–6.

1 The last poem began with two Greek names that riddlingly denoted the Roman present; this poem resoundingly repeats a name that proclaims ancient Rome. After the alien narrators of 4.2 and 4.3, the narrator-poet re-establishes possession, with an archetypal poet's announcement. Latin poets often begin 'I sing' or the like (the *Aeneid*, Grattius etc.); cf. Call. fr. 86 Pfeiffer (beginning of *Aetia* 4).

scelus . . . turpe: the moral stance of the narrator is driven home. *Tarpeium nemus* (Ω) is not justified by the poem: the grove of 3–6 can hardly be called 'Tarpeia's' or made the poem's subject. The *sepulcrum* no longer existed (cf. Varro *LL* 5.41, Plut. *Rom.* 18.1, and Simonides' non-existent tomb in Call. fr. 64 Pfeiffer); but it gave the Tarpeian rock and citadel their name. *turpe* denies Piso's argument from T.'s honoured tomb to her virtue (fr. 11 Forsythe *ad fin.*). T.'s actual burial will be elided, though prefigured by a metaphorical burial (91–2).

2 fabor: a more pompous verb than *dicam*; cf. Cic. fr. 25.3 Blänsdorf, Virg. *Aen.* 1.261. It stresses the act of speech.

antiqui . . . Iouis: not the massive temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, built later, but Romulus' small temple of Jupiter Feretrius, built just before (D.H. *Ant.* 2.34.4, Livy 1.10.5–7); hence *antiqui*.

The Sabines are evidently imagined to take both parts of the Capitol. The Capitol is a hill with two summits separated by a lower space. The larger of the two, in the usual terminology, was the Capitol proper, where the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus was to stand. The other, with S. Maria in Aracoeli now at the top, was the Arx, which T. guarded. But *Capitolium*, *Tarpeius*, and *arx* (*arces*) were fluid terms. On the area see e.g. F. Coarelli, *Roma* (Rome 1985) 25–37, *LTUR* 1 226–34, IV 237–8, *MAR* 57, 78–9, 275. The Arx seems here to accommodate the cult of Vesta; this is greatly preferable to T. leaving a sanctuary in the Forum for a night job as guard (cf. 23–7, 43–6, 69–70, and also Livy 1.11.6). For ancient discussion on Romulus and this cult, see esp. D.H. *Ant.* 2.64.5–66.1.

3–6 By a common convention (Williams (1968) 637–45), the narrative starts with a free-standing description of a place, which is then attached to an event. In poetry, such places are usually shown as existing to the present day (ἔτι 'there is')

(not 'was') e.g. Hom. *Il.* 2.811, initial *est* e.g. P. 4.6.15, Virg. *Aen.* 1.159); so P's *lucus erat* emphasizes that this scene exists no longer. A grove of Silvanus is especially natural and unurban (Plaut. *Aul.* 674–5, Virg. *Aen.* 8.597–602); a pastoral scene is painted in 5–6; *natiuis* emphasizes the contrast with man-made beauty (cf. 1.2.9–14 (*natiuis* 13), 20.35–6). The untamed abundance of foliage is stressed: *felix* ('fruitful'), *multa*, the loud rustle of leaves. But P's art has recreated the scene, as is hinted by *conditus* ('hidden', but also 'composed'). The tension is supported by works like the triclinium of the 'Villa of Livia', which turn a whole room into a grove (20–10 BC; Rome, Mus. Naz. Rom.; M. M. Gabriel, *Livia's garden room at Prima Porta* (New York 1955)). The scene contrasts not only with the present but with the events to come.

3 antro 'glade' or the like. Cf. 1.1.11, 2.11, 4.9.33.

4 obstrepit 'competes with the sound of' (*OLD* s.v. 1a).

5 domus: cf. e.g. 1.20.34 *grata domus Nymphis*.

7–8 †fontem†: *hunc* would be awkward when a spring had not been directly mentioned; such a thickly wooded spot seems an unlikely choice for a camp; T. could not reach the spring if it was encircled. As in 1 and 15, scribal interest in the scenery has affected the text. Camps's *propter* is in principle attractive (cf. e.g. Livy 9.2.13, 35.28.8–10 for the location): *hunc* is *lucus* (better *hunc propter Tatiū*?), and *castra* must be understood with *praecingit*, not altogether easily. For the mention of a place which will not itself be a setting cf. Virg. *Aen.* 8.597–605, where *haud procul hinc* of the camp follows the description of a *lucus*. Tatiū's warlike action contrasts with the peaceful behaviour of the shepherd (5–6). Nature is now forcefully manipulated: trees are made into a stockade, earth is heaped up around the camp.

fidaque: careful preparation is suggested; cf. Sil. 4.24 *fidō . . . obices* are given to the city gates. *fides* will become a theme and a problem of the poem.

9–10 The outburst springs from the mention of Tatiū's attack. Cf. 3.15.19–21, where an outburst to Jupiter, beginning with a question, springs from the mention of his lover's sufferings; 4.6.65–6, 10.27–30, after 23–4. The possibility of attack from the nearby Sabine capital Cures (cf. D.H. *Ant.* 2.48) now seems humiliating. Cf. Ov. *F.* 2.135 (denigrating Romulus) *te Tatiū parūque Cures . . . sensit. Roma* near the start of line 9 is set against *Curetis* (nom. adj.) at the end.

uicina agrees with *saxa*; seemingly it governs *Iouis*: the rocks of the citadel on one peak of the Capitol adjoin the peak where Jupiter resided (cf. 30). But the elaborate interweaving is unusual in P., and the position of the Sabine camp could also be suggested.

In the impressive pentameter the violent *quateret*, often used literally of warfare (so Livy 27.28.17 *muros quatiebant*) is juxtaposed to the deep and sustained noise. Cf. Lucr. 4.543 *tuba depresso grauius sub murmure mugit*, Petr. 36.7 *lentissima uoce*.

A positive argument against the unnecessary transposition of 9–14 to after 2 (Shackleton Bailey) is the rarity in P. of consecutive couplets ending with a noun

of the same form and reference like *Iouis* (contrast 2.15.24, 26, 3.10.16, 18; 4.9.16, 18 *boues* is quasi-pastoral).

11–12 and **13–14** were transposed by Schippers: the *atque* does not follow well on the question. But 13–14 lead better into 15, and 11–12 link up more effectively with the point of 9–10 (Rome was feeble). *ubi* . . . *equus* would not in itself so forcefully support an argument about Rome's weakness or rusticity. Consequently, we should change *atque* to *namque* (Heyworth, Hutchinson). 11–12 spell out the reason for thinking Rome no likeness of her present self.

The pentameter undoes the hexameter, with an embarrassing clash of names. In prose cf. Livy 5.48.8 (the Romans buy off the Gallic siege) *mille pondo auri pretium populi gentibus mox imperaturi factum*. P's location for the camp is more pointed than the Quirinal, or on the flat ground between Quirinal and Capitol (Varro *LL* 5.51, D.H. *Ant.* 2.38.1).

11 iura subactis: conquest and justice are combined.

13 murus erant montes: a neat and contemptuous phrase, condensing Varro, *LL* 5.41 *tot montibus quos postea urbs muris comprehendit*. The first stone wall around the city was ascribed to Tarquin (Livy 1.36.1, 38.6). Gates had been prominent in 4.3 (17, 71).

Curia saepta: see 4.1.11–14, 13–14nn.

14 ex alto (Fontein): *ex illo* would not have a point of reference in the text as it stands (or with the transpositions of Shackleton Bailey and Schippers). *exili* (Postgate) is less suitable for a stream used in watering horses (Wellesley (intro. to poem) 99). The line suggests the appurtenances of epic (cf. e.g. 2.10.2, 3.3.40), and the mighty stream drunk from by the epic poet (3.3.1–16, note *equi* 2; contrast 4.1.59–60). There had been much water in the Forum of early Rome; this is reflected e.g. in the story of Curtius (Livy 1.12.10, D.H. *Ant.* 2.42.5–6, Ov. *F.* 6.401–4).

15–16 The spring is not part of the camp itself; it does not strain imagination too much that T. should come to it, the juncture necessary to the story (cf. Livy 1.11.6; Ov. *F.* 3.11–12 (Vestal)). One might, however, suspect the tense of *libauit* ('drew', cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.371 *inde* . . . *libatos*). *urgebat* would be more fitting when the jug was full, and the sequence of the couplet suggests it; but in 21–2 (cf. *manus*) she seems to be still filling the vessel. A perfect might be best saved for the crucial moment of 19. *libabat* (Hutchinson) would make the couplet describe habitual action, as 14 describes repeated action. *et* (Fontein) is preferable to *at*, which should set one person against another. Cf. 4.7.11–12n.

deae: Vesta, as the informed reader will know (cf. Varro *LL* 5.41); so *deo* in 4.3.16. The next line gives a further indication. *laticem* (Barber) would be one possibility for *fontem*, intruded from 14; *ex* . . . *fonte* . . . *hinc fontem libauit* cannot be right.

urgebat: for the carrying of the vessel on the head cf. e.g. Ar. *Plut.* 1197–9; Villa della Farnesina (Augustan), Rome, Mus. Naz. Rom. inv. 1071, stucco

(I. Bragantini and M. de Vos (edd.), *Le decorazioni della villa romana della Farnesina* (Rome 1982) 177).

fictilis urna: the ancient feature (cf. 4.1.5) here marks an unexpected continuity. The cult of Vesta still used earthenware vessels (Val. Max. 4.4.11; cf. Kießel on Pers. 2.60).

[17–18] (del. Carutti): the outburst would have to be prompted by the presentation of T. as a Vestal in 15–16; the grounding does not seem adequate. Disruption of the narrative is unwelcome after the careful unfolding of 3–16; the couplet is out of place in tone and time. The language combines the extreme with the feeble: *malae* is unsuitable for so extravagant a question. *malus* should not mean ‘wicked’ rather than ‘malign’ in the poetry of this period; perversion of a specific role is different (2.24b.44 *hospes*, Ov. *Tr.* 3.12.9 *matris*). The meaning of *fallere* is unclear: if breaking an oath sworn by Vesta (N–H on Hor. *C.* 2.8.10), then *flammas* rather than *te* obscures the point; ‘escape the notice of’ (e.g. Livy 23.19.10) is too weak, ‘deceive’ is not apt. An obvious motive for interpolation would be the wish to identify the goddess of 15.

There is no fitting home for the couplet in the vicinity; after 2 (Wellesley), it is awkwardly preceded by a different point, and the *et* becomes unnatural. Transposition to the last part of the poem is intrinsically less plausible. After 92 (Broekhuizen), the switching of vocatives in the last three couplets would become awkward (Heyworth (1999) 84); because of the assertion *apta* 92, 17 with *nec* (Postgate) would have to mean unconvincingly that the many shields inflicted a multitude of deaths (contrast Lys. 12.37, Hor. *C.* 3.27.37–8 etc.). After 86 (so Housman), 17–18 would clash with *apta* (92), and spoil the sobriety of 92.

19–22 adapt a common pattern for describing love at first sight: there the verb of seeing is repeated with the onset of love (Hom. *Il.* 14.293–4, Virg. *Ecl.* 8.37–41 ... *uidi* . . .; *ut uidi, ut perii* . . ., Ov. *Am.* 3.10.25–8, *al.*). Here the verb of seeing is not repeated, and falling in love is not described directly: instead amazement (cf. 2.29b.25 *obstipui*) and the consequence for T.’s urn.

19 procludere ‘practise manœuvres’. Not real fighting (cf. *prolusio* Cic. *Div. Caec.* 47); but decisive in its impact on T. Other girls fall in love watching actual fighting: A.R. fr. 12.6–9 Powell, Val. Fl. 6.575–86, and probably Ov. *Met.* 8.19–37.

20 frena: Palmer’s conjecture would describe the reins being raised through the horse’s mane, where they had lain slack; cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.4.16 *frenaque in effusa laxa iacere iuba*. Manes should be thick (Virg. *G.* 3.86 etc.). It is not apparent why weapons should be raised through the mane; *arma* will have come from 21. Presumably the harness could be thought of as decorated by the relatively flamboyant Sabines. Cf. the more extensive decoration in 4.3.9 *pictoque Britannia curru*.

21 regalibus: a king’s arms will be especially fine, cf. Livy 30.12.11 *cum* . . . *Masinissam insignem cum armis tum cetero habitu conspexisset, regem esse* . . . *rata*. T.’s own familiar king has less appeal (26, 53–4). The Sabines’ arms in general seem different from the Romans’, and less austere (cf. 32, and 4.10.19–22 (Romulus)). Cf. on another Italic people Livy 9.40.1–6, 10.39.12 *per picta atque aurata scuta transire*

Romanum pilum, G. Schneider-Hermann, *The Samnites of the fourth century BC* (BICS Suppl. 61, 1996) 4-5. Foreign luxury had an effect even then – in the most manly form.

22 interque oblitās: the spondaic metre mimics T.'s mind. The particularly striking pattern disyllable + trisyllable comes only twelve times in book 4's pentameters.

excidit urna: cf. 4.8.53 for the effect of shock. The action also symbolizes T.'s abandonment of the Vestal spirit.

23-6 saepe . . . saepe: the repetition serves a narrative function, swiftly evoking a sequence (cf. 3.15.15-18); it also conveys the obsessive behaviour of love (cf. *Cir.* 172-6).

23-4 Religious excuses for women's movements form an unexpected link with the poet's present. Cf. 2.32.3-4, 4.8.1-16 (both of Cynthia), Tib. 1.6.21-2, cf. 1.3.17 (man's excuses for not going, *sum causatus . . . omina dira*). Since Tatius would not be on view at night, the omens only form the reason for T. to descend in the morning and purify herself. For washing in rivers and streams after nocturnal pollution, cf. e.g. Val. Fl. 5.329-52; for washing of the head, Pers. 2.15-16, Juv. 6.522-4 (note *matutino*). *comas* is more sensuous than the satirists' *caput*.

immeritae adds to the humour. P. plays with injustice in the neighbouring poems (4.3.19, 5.16); here there is hinted the mortal mistreatment of the Moon, a common subject for wit (A.R. 4.54-65, Ov. *Her.* 6.85-6, *Met.* 12.263-4).

25-6 Ritual is now actually performed, but with a personal and traitorous aim. For offerings of flowers and plants to Nymphs cf. e.g. Hor. *C.* 3.27.30. The hexameter is attractive and pastoral; *argentea* instead of *candida* makes an ironic contrast with modern luxury, cf. 3.13.25-34, Ov. *Met.* 8.668-9 *caelatus eodem . . . argento* (i.e. clay). *blandis* recalls the *faciles* Nymphs of pastoral (Virg. *Ecl.* 3.8-9), and perhaps evokes elegy (4.6.5n.). The pentameter brings in treachery and war. However, the concern for Tatius' beauty as well as his welfare strikes an elegiac note; cf. Tib. 1.1.67-8. T.'s prayer is ironic in the light of what Tatius will do to her with his men's weapons (91). Short-lived lilies, aptly offered to the dead, may be symbolic too (cf. Nic. fr. 74.70 G-S etc.).

27-8 P. is blurring a movement from repeated actions in 23-6 to a single action in 29-30. T. returns after a day of looking at Tatius. She has been hiding in the brambles, as she needs to remain unobserved (so Agenor in Hom. *Il.* 21.556-61; cf. Livy 25.21.3), and comes back at twilight, when fires are being lit (cf. Virg. *Ecl.* 1.82-3).

cumque: there seems little point to 'while she climbed (*dum* Ω) . . . , she brought back'; we should read *cum* (Heyworth), and perhaps make the same change at 3.13.52.

primo . . . nubila fumo: the phrase atmospherically combines 'dim at the first lighting of fires' and 'hazy with smoke'.

After the hexameter has named the Capitol (the whole hill), in the pentameter the brambles imply a rough rustic scene beneath, the more so for the echo of Virg. *G.* 3.444 *hirsuti secuerunt corpora uespres* (of sheep). In part, they reinforce the

wild appearance of early Rome, but in less idyllic vein than 3–6; cf. e.g. 3.13.28, Ov. *Med.* 4 for brambles as part of a simple world. *hirsutus* ('hairy, rough') evokes elsewhere in the book the primitive, the virile, the epic (1.61, 9.49, 10.20).

29 refers in some way to the *arx Tarpeia*. From there T.'s lament is borne to Jupiter on the neighbouring peak. Stat. *Theb.* 11.417 *ab omni plangitur arce* has a less explicit audience. *Tarpeia* . . . *arce* (Ω) is crudely incongruous when the place has not yet been named. *suā* (*Tarpeia sua* Palmer) would give an attractive superimposition of time, but the proper name is surprising after 15–28, and is most likely a gloss (Helmbold).

30 uulnera forms part of a growing series with the mere cuts of 28 and T.'s eventual destruction. It seems too rigid to insist that Jupiter will punish not her passion but her crime (Heyworth (1999) 82–3, who reads *uicinae* (dative) . . . *Iouis*); the passion is the cause of the crime. *non patienda* suggests several areas of meaning: in particular Jupiter was not to and could not tolerate the passion: cf. e.g. Tib. 2.5.24 *moenia, consorti non habitanda Remo*; P. 4.11.4, Ov. *F.* 6.118 *nullo est inuenienda modo*; Sen. *Thy.* 777–9 *o Phoebe patiens, . . . sero occidisti*. The narrator vehemently condemns T.'s speech before she delivers it.

31–66 T.'s speech may be contrasted with Arethusa's modern letter. A tradition of female monologue lies behind it: relevant are those of Apollonius' Medea (3.636–44 etc.), and of the loving Ariadne in the shorter epic Catullus 64 (132–201). Ovid's Scylla will continue the line (*Met.* 8.44–80). Monologues often depict lucidly the formation of a decision. T.'s is less clear-cut; but there are important movements: from humble hopes (31–4) to high (55–6, 59–62), from wishes (33–4) to plans (47–52), from talking about Tatius (33–4, 37–8) to addressing him (47–66). The speech broadly grows more definite and optimistic; but the practicality begins directly after a guilty and emotional passage (39–46), and a quieter close (63–6) succeeds the climax.

31–4 T. begins from what she can see at night: the campfires. The fires are addressed; for such opening address cf. e.g. Ar. *Eccl.* 1–18 (monologue), to the speaker's lamp. Mental seeing leads T. on to imagining her favourite sight, Tatius.

31 ignes evokes other fires: Vesta's fires, fires on the Capitol, stars, love, the beloved (cf. 28, 45, 70–1, Virg. *Aen.* 2.154 *uos . . . ignes* (stars), e.g. Man. 4.683 *suos ignes* of the loved one). It is less clear that all the water in the poem coheres.

castrorum: Arethusa yearned for distant, Roman camps (4.3.45).

Tatiae: an adj., cf. 4.9.74, and e.g. *lex Sulpicia*, N–W II 29–35. The name itself comes climactically in 34.

praetoria turmae: incongruously military language. The *praetorium* (poetic pl. here) is the building to which the most important soldiers are called. These are the *turma*, an elite band; cf. Sal. *Jug.* 98.1, Livy 37.20.10 *inter equites cum turma sua*, App. *Iber.* 365, A. Passerini, *Le coorti pretorie* (Rome 1939) 3–10. Presumably these are also the select group that will attack the citadel, and kill T.: cf. D.H. *Ant.* 2.39.2 'with the most excellent part of his army', 91 *comitum* below. It is ironic that T. singles them out.

32 Here not greed but love makes Sabine arms appeal; the magic is enhanced by foreign glamour. It is paradoxical for a woman, in love, to find arms beautiful; it is paradoxical for anyone to find Sabines glamorous. In elegy they more often suggest primitive austerity (so 2.32.47–8: no *duros* . . . *Sabinos* now; Ov. *Med.* 11–12). *formosa oculis arma Sabina meis* perhaps plays with this double perspective. For the Sabines as ‘luxurious livers’ in their time see D.H. *Ant.* 2.38.3, E. Dench, *From barbarians to new men* (Oxford 1995) 85–94; for the archaeology, including gold, *I Sabini* (Rieti 1997) 51–77.

oculis . . . meis ‘to my eyes, in my sight’. For the lover’s subjective sight cf. e.g. Quint. *Inst.* 6.2.6 *amantes de forma iudicare non possunt quia sensum oculorum praecipit animus*.

33–4 A more extreme wish even than Arethusa’s (4.3.45): T. wants the horrifying role of female prisoner-of-war. The elegiac *servitium amoris* is made real. *captiva* is pointedly repeated in 34 (‘by being a captive’); *uestros* . . . *Penates* is answered by *mei* . . . *Tati*. This is not the mock-capture of becoming a Vestal Virgin (*ueluti bello capta abducitur*, Gel. 1.12.13); and it is utterly unlike the glory of marriage as queen (55–62; cf. the wishes of T. in Simyl. *SH* 724.3–4). T. rises from this lowly conception to marriage; Ariadne’s and Scylla’s monologues sink back from marriage to slavery as an unattainable second-best (Cat. 64.158–63; *Cir.* 443–6, with Lyne).

33 blends being in the city of Cures (cf. e.g. Ov. *Met.* 8.91 *patriaeque meosque Penates*, Livy 45.24.12 *Penatibus publicis priuatisque*, Sil. 12.601) with sitting near the Penates’ shrine in one house (cf. 3.7.45 *uiueret ante* . . . *Penates*, Tib. 1.10.15–16).

dum with subj. ‘so long as’.

conspicer: depon. as usual, if we read *ora* (Gronovius); *esse*, be seen to be, is pointless.

35–6 The couplet may give some grounds for suspicion. Grammatically *pudenda* must mean that Vesta is now shameful to Rome (*probro* abl., ‘because of my sin’). This seems very overstated. *ualeat* in 36 should denote farewell, not dismissal (cf. *probro*). But 31–4 are merely a wish; a farewell seems premature. *Romani* anticipates *Roma*; the pattern of the line is anomalous, contrast e.g. Ov. *Ad* 1.255 *Baias praetextaque litora Bais* (Wills (1996) 262). 37–8 would follow 33–4 better than they follow 35–6 (cf. *Tati* . . . *Tatius*). Like the probably spurious 17–18, 35–6 bring in Vesta and moralizing. 3.21.15 *Romanae turres et uos ualeatis, amici* could be a model.

37–8 I.e. her beloved is Tatius (*re-* shows that *amores* does not denote T.). *amores* in this sense, perhaps rather colloquial, comes only here in P. (cf. e.g. Plaut. *Cur.* 357, Cat. 10.1). As the speech is delivered at night (cf. 27, 31, 63–6), the future seems inappropriate; we need rather a generalizing present (*reponit* Hutchinson), on the man often removed from T.’s sight into the camp (cf. 19–20).

Tatius, intent on military elegance, puts the mane to the desirable, not the normal, side (Varro *RR* 2.7.5, Ov. *Met.* 2.673–4; mistakenly I. C. Dodds, *CR* 18 (1968) 24). *ipse* betrays T.’s interest in his touch; those in love envy bridles, chains,

horses their physical contact with the beloved (Ov. *Met.* 8.36–7, Man. 5.573–4; Shakespeare, *AC* 456 ‘oh happy horse to beare the weight of *Anthony!*’).

39–42 Her love ‘declared’, T. accumulates examples of destroying one’s own through love for an enemy or foreigner. Such accumulation of examples was probably established in love-elegy from the Hellenistic period on. See M. Huys, *Le poème élégiaque hellénistique* P. Brux. inv. E. 8934 et P. Sorb. inv. 2254 (Brussels 1991), a poem where the narrator is probably a jealous lover, and *SH* 964.11–20 (not including Scylla); cf. P. Oxy. 3723. The character speaks like the poet; cf. 2.14.1–10, including Ariadne, and 3.19, ending with Scylla.

39–40 Like Virgil and Ovid, P. at will fuses the two Scyllas, ‘incorrectly’, or separates them (fusion e.g. Virg. *Ecl.* 6.74–7; play with scholarly protest *Cir.* 54–91; separation e.g. P. 3.19.21–8, Virg. *G.* 1.404–9). One Scylla betrayed her father Nisus and her city for love by cutting a lock of hair on which Nisus’ life and Megara’s fate depended; the other Scylla had dogs protruding from her lower half.

quid mirum: T. argues that her treachery (43–4) makes theirs unsurprising; cf. Livy 34.2.3 *fabulam* . . . *ducebam esse* (Lemnian women). Much more amazing, the reader might think, are the mixed forms of Scylla and the Minotaur (41), or even the magic hair: such stories, unlike T.’s, are text-book impossibilities (Scylla: Gorg. fr. B3.80 D–K, [Plato] *Axioch.* 369c3–6, Ov. *Am.* 3.12.21–2; the strangeness of the Minotaur; Eur. *Cret.* fr. 472b.29–39 Kannicht). With similar play at Ov. *Am.* 1.4.7 *desine mirari*, it is the lust of the Centaurs not their form that had amazed.

saeuisse suits the argument and the myth (cf. Stat. *Silv.* 3.4.84 *coma saucia Nisi*). The crude repetition *saeuos* is avoided with Heinsius’ *foedos*, which contrasts with *candida* (cf. Ov. *Met.* 14.60 (Scylla) *foedari* . . . *inguina*).

candida . . . inguina: from Virg. *Ecl.* 6.75. In art the dogs begin at her private parts, e.g. coin of Sex. Pompeius, 42–40 BC, *RRC* no. 511/4.

41–2 Minos forms a link between Ariadne (his daughter) and Scylla (his admirer). Ariadne helped Theseus kill the Minotaur, son of her mother and a bull; he escaped from the labyrinth with her aid (42: ‘when the twisted way was made open by the gathering of thread’). T. will tell Tatus the way, but Tatus will be no Theseus: Theseus loved Ariadne, briefly. *prodit* and *fraterni* promote the argument on treachery, though strikingly combined with *cornua* and *monstri*; the perspective comes from Cat. 64.181 *fraterna caede* (Ariadne speaking). In art Ariadne often encourages the killing: so Attic black-figure cup (c. 540 BC), Munich 2243 (J. 333), *ABV* 163.2 (*LIMC* III 1.1054 no. 28).

43 Ausoniis . . . puellis ‘for Roman girls’ (cf. e.g. 3.4.5 *Ausoniis ueniet prouincia uirgis*, Luc. 7.33). Early or contemporary Rome can be separated in this way from Greek myth or history (2.3.29–38 (Cynthia) *gloria Romanis* . . . *puellis* . . . , 6.15–22 (Romulus), Livy 28.41.17–42.1). T. is conscious of her own terrible exemplarity.

44 improba and **uirgineo** clash (Ov. *F.* 6.289 (Vesta) *uirgo* . . . *uirgine laeta ministra*). T. was intrinsically wicked, she claims, even when chosen; later Vestals began between the ages of six and ten (Labeo II.3 Bremer).

foco: the dat. can replace the gen. of ordinary usage. Cf. 82, Ov. *Met.* 1.562 *postibus . . . custos*, Tac. *Hist.* 1.88.1 *ministros bello*; G. Landgraf, *ALL* 8 (1893) 62–9, E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica*, 2nd edn. (Lund 1956) I 210–14.

45–6 T.'s tears will have a more extreme effect than Arethusa's (4.3.3–4). The idea derives from Cic. *Font.* 47 (peroration): Vesta's fire must not be put out by the tears of Fonteius' Vestal sister, *sacerdotis uestrae lacrimis*. Here the tears recall love-elegy and heroines in love (e.g. A.R. 3.656–64 (Medea), Virg. *Aen.* 4.30 (Dido)).

Pallados: Minerva's statue was kept in Vesta's sanctuary, and like her and her fire came from Troy (cf. 69, Ov. *F.* 6.417–36). Here the fire is unexpectedly attributed to Minerva, to add another, and even more formidable, virgin.

mirabitur: cf. *quid mirum?* (39, 41). But Vesta's fires sometimes did go out, to the general alarm (Livy 28.11.6–7, *Perioch.* 41, D.H. *Ant.* 2.67.5).

ignoscat: the introduction of an imagined viewer articulates the tension between a patriotic and an amorous evaluation.

47 cras: T. moves briskly to imagining a scheme.

tota . . . urbe: less impressive for the reader of P.'s day, with a far larger city; cf. 4.3.17.

potabitur (Palmer): at the Parilia tomorrow (73). Cf. *ebria* 78, Tib. 2.5.87–90 (*potus* at the Parilia). Drinking all over the city, natural but not compulsory, might readily be rumoured; as a city festival the Parilia was still novel. *pugnabitur* (Ω) would be an odd thing to tell one commander; the commander could not lead the secret expedition in mid-battle. *pigrabitur* (Housman), alleged to mean 'there will be laziness', does not yield a likely rumour.

48 tu: Tatiüs, in contrast with the drunken Romans. (For *tu* without explicit contrast cf. Virg. *G.* 4.106–7, Tib. 1.1.67.) The pronoun is needed to mark the sudden address. T. mentally becomes a Medea instructing a Jason (A.R. 3.1027–62): a daring use of monologue. The absence of a name shows her obsession. In the plan T. envisages here, Tatiüs needs first to occupy the side of the Capitol proper out of enemy view (cf. 47 (daytime?); Livy 39.32.3 *montem . . . ceperunt*; *OLD* s.v. *tergum* 6); he would later move to the Arx (cf. D.H. *Ant.* 2.38.5). 49–50 exclude the Tarpeian Rock, for the location of which cf. F. Coarelli, *Il foro romano* (Rome 1983–5) II 80–7.

capē sp-: P. often has such prosody in the first foot: cf. 3.11.53, 67, 4.1.41.

rorida 'moist' from underground waters (49–50).

49–50 The description displays a wild Capitol. The language suggests to the reader treachery by T., and arguably Tatiüs (cf. *Cir.* 414–15), and unpredictability for T. Such connotations are obvious in *perfida*, *latentis* (*tacensis* (Ω) would not be clear enough), *fallaci*, *celat*; for *lubricus* cf. (cunning and deceit) Virg. *Aen.* 11.716 *patrias temptasti lubricus artes*, Tac. *Hist.* 2.101.2 *lubrica ad mutandam fidem*; Cic. *Flac.* 105 (danger, opposed to *stabilis*), Sen. *Ep.* 99.9 (with *fallax*).

tota: the way to the Arx is envisaged too. *semper* matches *tota* rhetorically; it stresses the dangerous character of the path. The water, just underground, does

not depend on seasons or rain. Cf. Sen. *NQ* 3.7.3–4 (underground water on hills); *Ep.* 104.15 *irriguas perennibus aquis ualles* (remarkable, cf. *semper*). *limite* is synonymous with the subject *uia*, cf. e.g. 1.20.20 (subj. *Argo*, obj. *ratem*), Housman on Man. 1.539 with addenda. With *caespes* (Palmer) the relation of path and grass would become unclear; it cannot denote a river-bank (so Goold (1966) 88).

51 o utinam echoes 33: but T. now wants a more active part.

nossem: like Medea, whose magic *song* (A.R. 4.146–7, 157–8, cf. e.g. Val. Fl. 8.69) provided *help* (A.R. e.g. 3.990, cf. e.g. Ov. *Met.* 7.29) to the *beautiful* Jason (A.R. e.g. 3.956–61, cf. e.g. Sen. *Med.* 82–9). The exemplum, as in 39–42, is ominous: Medea was rash, Jason faithless (P. 2.21.11–12, 4.5.41–2, *al.*).

cantamina: a word specifically for magical chants, common in the alleged magician Apuleius (*Apol.* 26.6 etc.). For the non-literary *Musa* cf. *C. de Pond.* 102 (*PLM* v p. 77) *mechanica* (an art), e.g. Plato *Polit.* 309d2–3 ‘the Muse of the ruler’s art’.

magicae cantamina Musae contrasts, for the reader, with the poetry T. is unwittingly uttering.

52 hanc, as well as guidance along the path (cf. 49–50; 93, Ov. *F.* 1.261–2). *haec* (Ω) ‘mine, like Medea’s’ leaves the point of 49–50 unexplained. Enchantments would not help with mud. A lacuna after 50 would be possible too.

formoso: Tatiush, who is in her mind. Adj. used as noun: cf. 1.22.8 *miseri*, 2.28.2 *tam formosa*.

53 toga picta decet: T. justifies her help (52). The fine triumphal garb (for its magnificence cf. Quint. *Inst.* 11.1.3) befits the *formosus* Tatiush, not a king of inhuman origins. *toga picta* is the purple toga adorned with gold later worn by the general in a triumph (Livy 45.40.6 *Paullus, auro purpuraque fulgens*, App. *Lib.* 297, *RIC* 1st Aug. 96–101); the term is easily applied to the purple garment recently worn by Romulus for the first triumph (D.H. *Ant.* 2.34.2–3). Applying it to Romulus’ ordinary costume instead would be more awkward: the *toga picta* for kings was first introduced by Tullius (D.H. *Ant.* 3.61–2, cf. Macrob. *Sat.* 1.6.7). Cf. Mommsen (1887–8) 1 410–1, 429 n. 6, H. S. Versnel, *Triumphus* (Leiden 1970) 58, 91–2.

honore: ‘the honour of having a mother’ is odd (most people do), ‘of being a mother’ irrelevant, ‘of having a respectable mother’ banal and complicated. *amore* (Hutchinson) would add a hint that someone nurtured not by a loving mother but a cruel wolf is unsuited to be loved. Parents’ *amor*: e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 1.643–4 *patrius*, *CIL* VI 10230.4–5 (1st cent. BC) *maternus*; the corruption: Stat. *Silv.* 4.4.101 (probably). Love’s ethos conflicts with rearing by fierce beasts. (P. 2.6.19–20 Romulus acts from love though *nutritus duro* . . . *lacte lupae*; Virg. *Aen.* 4.367 loveless Aeneas suckled by tigresses; Cat. 61.100–1 human breasts *teneris*; Sen. *Prov.* 2.5 motherly softness.) T.’s attitude to the wolf, in Romulus’ own day, recalls the contemporary picture in 4.1.37–8 (contrast 55–6).

54 nutrit ‘nursed’. The present is used of the past even outside narrative cf. e.g. 4.1.121 *edit*.

55 dic: Housman takes *sic* as ‘on condition I betray’ (318); but this is uncomfortable when the act has not just been mentioned, and would be hard for the reader to grasp.

hospes: cf. A.R. 4.89 ξείνι ‘stranger’ (Medea to Jason).

pariamne is perhaps defensible (cf. S. J. Green, *CW* 97 (2004) 367–9). Giving birth comes to T.’s mind through the mention of the infant Romulus, whose unfortunate Vestal mother (cf. 53) bore him in prison (Fab. Pict. fr. 7a.7 Chassignet) or at Vesta’s shrine (Ov. *F.* 3.45–8). The emphasis is on queenship and on marriage, which is naturally accompanied by childbirth; cf. e.g. Stat. *Theb.* 12.538–9 (Hippolyte criticized) *quod . . . hosti ueniat paritura marito*. T.’s shameless forwardness fits with 57–8. If we emend, we want, not the pointlessly impudent *spatierne*, but something like ‘live’ or (with *tuam . . . aulam*) ‘enter’.

The alternatives of 55–8 are not being Tatius’ queen in Rome (55–6) or in Cures (57–8): so Shackleton Bailey. 56 is more plausibly seen as an argument for marriage than for living in Rome; the revenge of 57–8 does not suit a marriage to make peace.

sub ‘in’, used of houses at Hor. *Epod.* 9.3, *C.* 4.4.26, Ov. *Ex P.* 1.7.58.

56 Husbands were promised a dowry, with a view to the wife’s support (M. Kaser, *Das römische Privatrecht* (Munich 1971–5) II 332–6, S. Treggiari, *Roman marriage* (Oxford 1991) ch. 10). The line perverts the formal declaration made by woman or (for girls) father: so much *tibi doti erunt* (*Dig.* 23.3.25, 44.1, 59 *pr.*). Cf. 3.19.23 (perverted dowry), Ov. *Her.* 6.117 *dos tibi Lemnos erit*.

57–62 The current war was about the Roman abduction of the Sabine women (the Romans were short of wives). The Rape and T. both appeared in the work (or works) behind the *Basilica Pauli* and the coins of Titurius, *RRC* no. 344/1–2. Elegists often stress, historians often deny, the connection with more ordinary rape (2.6.19–22, Ov. *AA* 1.101–32; D.H. *Ant.* 2.30.5, Plut. *Rom.* 14.7, App. *Reg.* fr. 5.2 V–R). Here T. forgets the marriage that followed (*si minus*); she wants the terrifying abduction. For the reader 59–60 evoke, and contrast with, the noble action of the Sabine women in coming between the armies and effecting a treaty. Cf. e.g. Livy 1.13.1–5, 34.5.8.

57–8 The structure emphasizes, for Tatius, neat retaliation (*raptae . . . rape, Sabinae* | *me* etc.); it also throws | *me rape* into startling relief. *rapio* implies, but does not denote, the sexual act that follows abduction; the words still seem extraordinary (contrast the ironic *rape* at 4.1.117). T.’s audacity is to entertain, more than shock, the reader: that is suggested by the adroit handling of myth and argument, and the prosy *si minus* ‘if I am not to marry you’ (avoided by poets other than Ovid).

impune: 2.6.21 *rapere . . . docuisti impune Sabinas* (addressed to Romulus). P.’s character now exploits the same story from within.

lege: the natural justice of exact revenge; so *lex* Ov. *AA* 1.655. Cf. Sen. *Ep.* 81.7. *alternus* is more normally employed of a reciprocated action, but *lege* needs definition.

59–60 At Ov. *Met.* 8.47–8, the idea of peace through marriage precedes Scylla's more evil scheme (cf. *Cir.* 328–39, 355–61); here it becomes only a ploy to persuade. Patriotism motivates Pieria's reconciliation of peoples through Phrygius' love (Call. fr. 80 Pfeiffer, with addenda in vol. II).

ego possum: cf. the poet-narrator's own less surprising assertion of power at 1.10.15 *possum ego diuersos iterum coniungere amantes*.

†nuptae . . . palla†: we need an item distinctive of weddings; *palla* is an ordinary woman's garment. Conceivably *nuptae* could show that *palla* meant the bridal *flammeum*, a cloth that came over the body as well as the head (J. L. Sebesta and L. La Follette in Sebesta and Bonfante (1994) 48, 55–6). But why *palla inite*? 'On' seems pointless, 'in' improbable. And *nupta* (Lütjohann), followed not preceded by punctuation, is preferable to *nuptae* preceded by a strong pause and followed by enjambement: *nuptae* does not take up the first foot as in the other examples from books 2–4 (2.20.1 *quid fles* . . . ? *quid fles* |, 3.3.15, 23.13, 4.6.13). *medium* 'reconciling' would be a little odd of the treaty itself (at [Quint.] *Decl. Min.* 321.21 *media* stresses *cenae* not *fide*); something more spatial is suggested by *inite* and the Sabine context (cf. e.g. Luc. 1.118 *generos soceris mediae iunxere*; P. 2.9.50 of Jocasta). Possibly say *mediae facibus* . . . *meis*; cf. e.g. Sen. Rh. *Con.* 1.1.3 *me foederi medium pignus addite*. See McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.8.107–8 for adj. in the gen. accompanying a possessive pronoun, i.e. here referring to T.

uos: both sides are addressed; T.'s imagination expands.

61 adde . . . conde: lively imperatives to different people produce the climax; cf. the narrator at 4.1.67–8 (to be deflated). The opposites frame the line; war and wedding are opposed through their music. The trumpet (cf. 9–10) epitomizes war: see 4.3.20, Bacch. fr. 4.75 Maehler; Ar. *Peace* 1240–9, Tib. 1.1.75 etc. *Hymenaeae* mimics the refrain of wedding-songs (Plaut. *Cas.* 800 etc.); *modos* gestures to the hymenaeal metre that elegy cannot incorporate (cf. Cat. 61, Ticide fr. 1 Courtney).

62 credite actually invites readers' disbelief, cf. e.g. 2.26c.53, Ov. *F.* 3.370.

uestra meus . . . arma torus: the juxtapositions convey what T.'s imagined hearers would see as an emasculating contamination. Cf. the disapproving use of *mollis* at Sal. *Cat.* 11.5, Sil. 11.418–19 etc. The strong generic associations of *mollis* and *arma* compel the reader to question the poet-narrator's own activity, and its relation to his earlier preference of soft love-elegy to epic and war (cf. e.g. 1.7.17–20, 3.1.15–20, 3.5).

63–4 Her monologue seems to have lasted much of the night (cf. Odysseus' speech at Hom. *Od.* 15.296–495). At A.R. 3.811–24 Medea ends her night eager for the dawn and life; T. desires sleep and the fantasy of dreams.

bucina: the sounds of war continue, despite 61. The camp hears the beginning of the fourth and final watch of the night (not the end, cf. Livy 5.28.10, 24.46.2, 47.1); in that quarter of the night T. can sleep (65–72). For the watches cf. Polyb. 6.35.1–36.5, esp. 35.12. For the stars at this time of night cf. Stat. *Theb.* 3.683–5.

After the military hexameter, the pentameter presents nature in the traditions of poetry. For *Oceanum* cf. Hom. *Il.* 18.487–9, *Od.* 5.272–5, Call. fr. 19.10 Massimilla etc.

ipsaque: even the stars are weary, like T.; hence *lassa* (ς).

cadunt: cf., earlier at night, the *beginning* of Aeneas' speech to a *present* Dido on the capture of a city, Virg. *Aen.* 2.8–9 *iam . . . suadentque cadentia sidera somnos*. Virgilian resonance will increase in what follows.

65 experiar: as a means of seeing Tatius (*de te* etc. explains). With the dreams, cf. esp. those on Jason which *precede* Medea's monologue at A.R. 3.616–38, and the dreams of elegy (esp. 2.26a), taken up in 4.7, 4.11.81–2. For the idea outside poetry cf. *CIL* VI 18817.13–14 (wife speaking) *horis nocturnis ut eum uideam*.

66 fac uenias 'make sure you come', with no *ut*: an emphatic but not colloquial construction (cf. e.g. Lucr. 3.421; Virg. *Aen.* 12.438–9 with the more solemn *facito*). The emphasis brings out the unreality of T.'s communication with Tatius, as well as its touching intimacy (cf. the juxtaposition in 65 *de te mihi*).

oculis . . . meis echoes the first pentameter of the speech (32). This is another way of seeing Tatius; she acknowledges that it is enclosed in her own mind, unlike her actual sights of Tatius and her fantasies of marriage. The reader knows that Tatius could only be *benignus* as an *umbra*: the unreality is multiple.

67 dixit et: from Homer's ἦ (ῥα) καὶ 'he or she spoke and'. Such phrases come in elegy (so 2.29b.39, Call. fr. 80.5 Pfeiffer ἦ ῥα· cè δ' 'he spoke; and you'); but here, as at 4.6.55, 9.21, an epic flavour is retained.

incerto 'unpredictable', cf. *nescia* 68.

permisit 'surrendered'; cf. e.g. Quint. *Inst. pr.* 3 *permittamus uela uentis*.

68 nescia: the stern irony recalls epic narrators; cf. | νήπιος 'foolish' Hom. *Il.* 2.38, 22.445, A.R. 2.137.

accubuisse: with dat. usually 'sleep with' (2.3.30, 3.15.12, Tib. 1.9.75). An ironic contrast with the sexual dreams that 65–6 coyly hint at (cf. Ov. *Her.* 19.57–68). *furiis* is wild desire, as *nouis* shows (cf. 69–70). But *accubuisse* and 70 make a secondary connection with the Furies (for 70 cf. esp. Allecto at Virg. *Aen.* 7.456–7). *accubuisse* evokes the sexual suggestions of Allecto with Amata at Virg. *Aen.* 7.341–405 (R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Further voices in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford 1987) 13–26).

69 Vesta guards the fire Aeneas brought (Ov. *F.* 3.417–19 etc.), and guarded it even in Troy (Virg. *Aen.* 2.296–7 etc.). *felix* means both 'favourable' (so Virg. *Aen.* 1.330) and 'salutary' (so Mart. 5.1.7 *rerum felix tutela*). The Vestal's dreams concern Vesta; so perhaps do women's dreams in general (2.29.27). The goddess is nurturing T.'s sin to cause her punishment, like say Aristophanes' Clouds (*Clouds* 1454–61). The chaste Vesta's taking the role of Cupid (with *faces* cf. e.g. Tib. 2.1.81–2, Ov. *Am.* 2.9.5) produces the kind of clash seen in reverse at 3.17.9 (love) *ueteres custodit in ossibus ignes*. Kraffert's *Venus* (*Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung lateinischer Autoren* (Zurich 1882–3) 147) ignores the tradition on Vesta, and makes *felix tutela* harder to justify.

70 culpam alit: cf. Virg. *Aen.* 4.2 (Dido) *uulnus alit*, 172 (her *culpa*). The Virgilian narrator's complexity is turned into this narrator's unmixed severity.

71–2 T.'s heaven-sent madness recalls a Bacchante, and especially the Amazons, who joined Bacchus' campaigns and became like Maenads (Sen. *Oed.* 479–83, with Töchterle; cf. Polyae. 1.1.3 etc.). Hence the conjunction of the rivers Strymon and Thermodon, over 600 miles apart: the Thermodon is perpetually associated with the Amazons, and Amazons can be thought of as Thracian (Virg. *Aen.* 11.659–60 etc.; *Strymonis* is a fem. nom. adj. meaning 'Thracian'). The comparison of sleeping to active woman is deliberately unexpected; the reader remembers the sleeping Cynthia likened to a sleeping Maenad (1.3.5–6). The virgin's part in war makes comparison with the Amazons interesting (cf. 4.3.43–4n.). Dido is again recalled: cf. Virg. *Aen.* 1.490–3 (Amazon like Dido), 4.300–3 (Dido like Bacchante).

Thermodonta: the spondaic ending in this context evokes epic, especially Apollonius (Θερμόδοντος | 2.370, 805, 970).

pectus aperta: cf. e.g. Tib. 1.6.18 *laxo pectus aperta sinu*. This is the disorder of cult; cf. e.g. Ar. *Frogs* 412.

73–8 The narrative abruptly quits T. for a description which matches that in 3–6. That one led to Tatius, this to Romulus; that contrasted past and present, this connects them. The Parilia in the first century BC should be thought of, the evidence suggests, as a single festival, but with different activities in city (ritual purification associated with Vesta) and country (leaping over hay fires, cf. Pers. 1.71–2). See Ov. *F.* 4.721–806. Writers stress both rustic simplicity (Varro *Div.* viii app. (h) Cardauns, *R.* 2.1.9, Tib. 1.1.35–6, 2.5.87–90), and the foundation of Rome on this date (*Fast. Ant. Mai.* (II xiii 2.9; 84–55 BC), cf. J. Rüpke, *Kalender und Öffentlichkeit* (Berlin 1995) 57; Varro *RR* 2.1.9, Cic. *Div.* 2.98). T. bids to destroy Rome on its birthday. Both are relevant here, whatever the text; the usual role of Vestals (4.1.19–20n.) marks T. out. Further, the sense here of community and merriment contrasts with T.'s isolation and misery. On the Parilia see II xiii 2.443–5, M. Beard, *PCPS* 33 (1987) 1–15, Beard, North and Price (1998) 174–6.

73 Urbis erat festum (Hutchinson): for the gen. cf. Varro *LL* 6.24 *feriae non populi sed montanorum*, [Sen.] *Oct.* 646–7 *urbis festo* . . . *die. festum* is the noun, not *festus* (even at Tert. *Nat.* 1.13.4). *dies* cannot easily be understood from the next line, which is a new main clause. *qui* (Phillimore) . . . *esse, dies* makes a very ungainly couplet; it also introduces by conjecture a real sense-break in the second half of the pentameter with none at the caesura. (4.2.22 is the only possible instance in books 3 and 4.) If 74–5 are deleted, change of *festus* is still more essential. It is not difficult for a small word like *erat* to be omitted and then misplaced; cf. Π at 66 (*oculis minias*, or similar), and e.g. 3.16.7 *distulero haec* (N; *h. d.* Π), 14 *erit* om. FL. *Vrui* (Richmond), the festival of the Ploughtail, has no support in ritual and spoils the naming that follows, cf. e.g. Ov. *Ex P.* 3.2.45 *est locus in Scythia (Tauros dixere priores)*.

[74–5] 75 enters unsatisfactorily, whether it begins a new sentence (too note-like), or forms an apposition to *hic . . . dies* (*lusus* does not serve this function well), or to *festum* (*dixere . . . dies* becomes an unappealing two-part parenthesis). The division into country and town is odd here, after *Vrbi(s)* in 73. It is curious to limit *lusus* to the city, when *lusus* was certainly connected with the country (so Varro, *Div.* viii app. (h) Cardauns *lusus apud rusticos*), and 77–8 cannot at least be purely urban. In 74 *coepit* makes no clear sense; *hic . . . dies* plods. J. Butrica, *CQ* 50 (2000) 427–8, plausibly sees the lines as a glossing explanation. Cf. 3.7.[23–4] (*hoc iuvene . . .*); *annua* would come from 4.1.19.

76 pagana ‘of villages’ stresses country origins, after *Vrbis* (cf. Ov. *F.* 1.669–70 *pagus . . . paganis . . . focus*).

madent . . . deliciis: the dishes are ‘wet’ with succulent, and abundant, good things. *diuitiis* does not seem precise enough; Postgate’s *lautitiis* is not a poetic word.

77–8 use Tib. 2.5.89–90 *ille* (shepherd) *levis stipulae sollemnes potus acruos | accendet, flammam transilietque sacras*. Drunkenness, thematic in Tibullus, in P. adds to the urban aloofness of the depiction; a drunken festival also suits the tale, cf. Parth. EP 9.5, Livy 25.23.14, 16.

†raros†: ‘widely scattered’ is hard to make intelligible (J. Butrica, *CQ* 50 (2000) 476–7). *ternos* (Butrica) ‘three piles of’ rests on misunderstanding of Ov. *F.* 4.727 *transilui positas ter in ordine* (‘three times in succession’ cf. 1.317, 4.817, 6.155). *sacros* (Passerat) is not vivid enough; for *rutilos* (Hutchinson) cf. e.g. Ov. *Met.* 4.403 *rutilis . . . ignibus*.

79 Romulus suspends hostilities genially, or negligently (cf. e.g. Livy 25.37.16–18, 31.23.2). Contrast Jupiter at 86; *decreuit* is used again, pointedly. With the military *solui* cf. e.g. Luc. 1.402 *soluuntur . . . statione*; but in *otia solui* has negative suggestions too, cf. e.g. Livy 40.1.4 *otio solutam militarem disciplinam*, Sen. *Ira* 2.21.6 in . . . *otium non resoluemus* (of a boy).

80 intermissa: a prosaic and practical word. Between comedy and Ovid, it essentially belongs to prose (it is self-consciously unpoetic as the first word of Horace, *Odes* 4). For the silenced trumpet, cf. 61: now not T. bringing peace, but her seeing a chance for attack.

81–2 The crucial meeting is treated swiftly, with an animated density of clauses. Some of the language is rare in poetry (*conuenio* ‘meet’; everyday at Ov. *AA* 2.394, 3.586?), or rare in poetry before this (*pactum* ‘agreement’), or it may evoke history (*ratus* in an opening clause is very common in Livy, though sometimes found in poetry too). In the general historiographical account as given by D.H. *Ant.* 2.38.4–5, T. sends a servant first (Peisidice sends her nurse at Parth. EP 21.2). Here all is condensed, and T. kept alone. The treachery is highlighted by the placing of *Romulus* (79), *Tarpeia* and *hostem* (not *Tatium*).

suum tempus ‘her opportunity’ (*OLD* s.v. *tempus* 6a), cf. Sen. *Ben.* 2.25.3 *ait illum . . . opperiri debere tempus suum*.

pacta raises the idea that Tatius failed to fulfil an undertaking. Cf. Fab. Pict. fr. 10.11 Chassignet (Sabines' oath, their 'cheating on the agreement'), and also Parth. EP 22.2.

ligat: usually the *person* is 'bound'; but cf. *nexum* (an ancient form of agreement) and perhaps Inc. Pall. 32 Ribbeck *ob colligandas nuptias*.

comes points to marriage (88–92) as well as her guidance.

83–4 A lacuna is desirable after 83 (Richmond). It is doubtful usage to apply *remissus* either to *mons* ('unguarded' Goid) or to *ascensum* (*ascensum monstrat dubium festoque remissum* Housman, Hanslik: 'left free for the festival day' (Heyworth (1999) 83)). And perhaps *remissis* (Π) was more likely to be changed to *-us* (ΝΛ) than the reverse. The context suggests Roman dissipation: cf. e.g. Sal. *Jug.* 58.1 *remissis qui in praesidio erant*, Livy 4.37.2 *festo die graues somno epulisque*, 8.16.9. T. is not the most likely subject of *occupat ense* (why not the Sabines?). *nec mora* should relate two actions in an effective sequence (like an order and its fulfilment). With *mons erat ascensu dubius* or *ascensum monstrat* we should want 'without delay they began to climb', not 'without delay she killed the dogs'. With *mons erat ascensus* (Jacob) *dubius festoque remissus*, the killing of the dogs would not be the crucial sequel; and *-que* should not join the opposed *dubius* and *festo remissus*. If only two lines are missing, the pentameter would speak of Romulus' soldiers, the hexameter of T. (addressed?) bidding Tatius enter the Arx. His killing of the dogs (through his soldiers, cf. 91) would effectively show swift compliance. We could keep *tuis* in 86 (cf. e.g. Ov. *F.* 2.178–80 for the switch to the 3rd pers. in 87). *mons erat ascensus dubius* 'the dangerous hill had been climbed' (cf. *OLD* s.v. *dubius* 9a) takes up 49–50; information about the hill (*ascensu* (Ω) *dubius*) is unwanted here.

occupat 'catches by surprise' (*OLD* s.v. 11b) before they can bark (*uocales*).

canes: for the dogs cf. e.g. Livy 5.47.2–3 (Gauls' attack). Juno's geese, and Juno, are not yet on the Capitol (cf. for the geese e.g. Livy 5.47.4, P. 3.3.12, Plut. *Fort. Rom.* 325c).

85 †praebebant somnos† cannot mean 'displayed a state of sleep' (cf. *TLL* s.v. *praebeo* 388.64–390.5; Heyworth (1999) 83–4). E.g. *prostrat somnus*, unlike *praebebat somnus* (Markland: 'was giving Tatius all'), keeps the antithesis *omnia . . . unus*, and does not suggest the coming capture will be prevented. *omnia* would relate to the Capitol (cf. e.g. Livy 34.20.9), not sound like a general description of nature, as in *omnia carpebant somnos*. *prostrat* would indicate the imminent overthrow of the Romans (cf. *iacentem* 87, Cic. *Marc.* 23 *omnia . . . iacere . . . belli . . . impetu . . . prostrata*), and connote the postures of sleep.

86 inuigilare: cf. Hom. *Il.* 2.1–4 (Zeus alone awake), Soph. *Ant.* 604–6, Cic. *Mil.* 85 (Jupiter) *aliquando ad eum puniendum oculos aperuisti*. Jupiter, though more active than Romulus, is not saving the Capitol, only punishing its betrayal, through his general direction of events. He can hardly decide now that T. should be awake (*te . . . unam* (Wellesley), *sed . . . illam* (Heyworth)), in the middle of her planned night of treachery.

87 portaeque fidem: her trust with regard to the gate. An unusual type of gen.; more usual e.g. Ov. *Met.* 3.128 *fraternaue fidem pacis petiitque deditque*. Elsewhere T. appears as guardian, or temporary guardian, of the Arx (Plut. *Rom.* 17.2; D.H. *Ant.* 2.38.4); arrangements with the other Vestals are not explained. Having violated *fides*, she cannot expect it, it is suggested (cf. Livy 1.11.9).

iacentem 'lying prostrate, defeated' now (*OLD* s.v. 5a); cf. Ov. *Met.* 8.114 (Scylla's *patria*) *superata iacet*. In D.H. *Ant.* 2.41–4 the capture of the Capitol appears much less momentous.

88 is monstrously juxtaposed to the hexameter. Where T. sees betrayal and marriage as two parts of an agreement, the narrator shows hideous inconcinnity. *-que* conveys her logic and his indignation. A.R. fr. 12.12–18 Powell is much more expansive on the matter (cf. Simyl. *SH* 724.3–4): Peisidice rejoices in her country's fall. Here T. is made to seem without sensibility, and assured (cf. Scylla, Ov. *Met.* 8.88).

quem uelit ipse: the subj. represents her words; cf., with *petebant*, Livy 33.42.4. *quem uelit* would lose point with *ipsa*. Assuming the marriage itself, she is politely consulting his convenience. Courtesy, audacity and triviality in this context make T. a somewhat humorous figure here, for all the narrator's moralizing.

89 Though an enemy, Tatius did not give T.'s crime, i.e. T., the distinction (cf. e.g. P. 4.2.64 *datur . . . honos*) of marriage to him. 90 superficially contradicts, 91 confirms. At 3.19.27–8 the narrator similarly approves Minos' killing Scylla: *uictor erat quamuis, aequus in hoste fuit*. However, by this brisk parenthetical comment we are actually reminded of controversy and problems (as by Virgil's parenthesis on Mettus at *Aen.* 8.643). For the controversy on the act of Tatius, who has here broken an agreement, cf. 81–2n., Piso fr. 11.40 Forsythe, Livy 1.11.7, Val. Max. 9.6.1, Plut. *Rom.* 17.3.

90 nube takes up *nubendi* from T.'s implied speech (88). Death grimly replaces marriage, and crushing (*obruit*) replaces rising (*scande*). Tatius' short speech contrasts with T.'s long monologue (*dixit et* 67, 92; imperatives 61). Contrast in length marks contrast in power: cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* 1.1.24 (Cupid's brief reply to the narrator's long protest, with decisive action).

regni mocks her dreams (cf. 55).

scande: ancient beds were mounted, with a footstool (G. M. A. Richter, *Ancient furniture* (Oxford 1926) 136).

91 P. dispatches without vividness, in a line, the most spectacular moment of the story, and a horribly gradual process (cf. *RRC* no. 344/2 etc.; Calp. fr. 7.15 Chassignet, Plut. *Rom.* 17.4, App. *Reg.* fr. 4 V–R). The Basilica Pauli offers a pathetic and erotic treatment; P. himself is vivid on Dirce's death at 3.15.37–42. The handling here is deliberately surprising; but it expresses, like Tatius' brief speech, the sudden and decisive violence with which the man ends the woman's passionate existence.

super: adv., 'on top of her'.

obruit armis: from Livy 1.11.7 *obrutam armis necauere*. It is a group action (*RIC* 1² Aug. 299, Basilica Pauli, Calp. fr. 7.15 Chassignet, cf. A.R. fr.12.20 Powell); but the narrator stresses the individual male, through the military fiction whereby a commander is said to do what his men do.

92 The narrator continues, and sharpens, Tatius' speech. *uirgo* contrasts with the compassionate neoteric and Virgilian *a uirgo infelix!* (Calv. fr. 9 Courtney, Virg. *Ecl.* 6.52). The dowry promised to Tatius (56) turns into not support but death for the wife; the arms are precious metal. The dowry cannot here be metaphorically given to the wife, in defiance of custom. (At Man. 5.615 *nupturam dote mariti*, a metaphorical dowry from the husband, the change is signalled explicitly.) *officiis* is polemical: services should normally be rewarded. Cf. Ov. *Met.* 8.130–1 (Scylla to Minos) *scelus hoc patriaeque patrique, | officium tibi sit*.

93 The narrator moves matter-of-factly to the scholarly consequences. The last part of Callimachus' *Hecale* presented etymologies from her name (*Dieg.*). The sudden dryness is very Hellenistic; so the close at A.R. 2.929 'hence the name of the place is Lyre'.

Tarpeium (Palmer): adj., a choice construction; cf. e.g. Ov. *Her.* 1.14 *nomine in Hectoreo*.

94 The text is very uncertain. *uigil* 'guard' indicates T.'s duty for the gate (cf. 87), but also touches on her being 'wakeful' during this and the preceding night. *praemia* should be a 'reward' to T. for the noun in the gen. (the normal usage); cf. Ov. *Met.* 8.105 *sceleris . . . praemia*. *praemia* should denote her punishment; *habes* then matches *est . . . adeptus*. (The name would hardly be a real reward regardless of the reason.) This line is not repeating the same point as 92 (92n.).

iniustae . . . sortis is hard to make intelligible. *iniusti . . . amoris* (Heyworth (1999) 85–6) attracts. Possibly *iniusti* should be e.g. *incesti*: *iniustus* is applied, following law, to an adulterer's passion at Ov. *F.* 2.779, but it seems less apt for a Vestal's. E.g. *ista tuae . . . noctis* would give more point to *uigil*. *ista . . . praemia* would refer back to the naming (cf. *iste* at e.g. 3.19.2, 4.3.28), a negative or worthless reward. *tuae . . . noctis* would refer to T.'s deeds in her last night (cf. *OLD* s.v. *nox* 3b), but play on love-elegy, where nights are an amorous commodity (cf. e.g. 3.13.1 *avidis nox . . . pretiosa puellis*, Ov. *AA* 3.610 *ne tanti* (figurative) *noctes non putet esse tuas*).

4.5: ACANTHIS

This poem returns us at last to the area characteristic of love-elegy: to the poet-narrator's own love. The main subject and speaker, however, is not P, or Cynthia, but the unromantic *lena* Acanthis (A.). *Lenae* are managers of prostitutes, or at least go-betweens who reap benefits from affairs. In love-elegy ordinary humans other than the narrator rarely speak at length (Cynthia's longest speech had been 3.6.19–34). Love-elegy, especially P's, contains few characters of substance beyond the narrator and the beloved as seen by the narrator. Here a vivid new

person talks at length. What has become a book of other voices offers a strange return to love-elegy.

Lenae existed. Augustus' legislation mentioned them (Ulp. *Dig.* 23.2.43.7–9; McGinn (1998) 135–8; R. Flemming, *JRS* 89 (1999) 51–3). One, a freedwoman, boldly names her profession and defends her honesty (*CLL* ix 2029; B. E. Stumpp, *Prostitution in der römischen Antike*, 2nd edn. (Berlin 1998) 211). But Acanthis has a literary resonance too (cf. P. J. Arnold, *ἡ πορνοβοσκός and leno in Greek and Roman comedy* (D. Phil. thesis, Oxford 1998)). Herodas 1 and 2 present and compare a *lena* (poem 1) and *leno* (poem 2). The *lena*'s age is stressed. She urges a woman to betray the man she loves with someone rich: a type of plot seen in Tib. 1.5.47–60 and Ovid, *Amores* 1.8, and the backbone of this poem. Herodas will be drawing on Greek comedy, though we have little direct evidence for the treatment of *lenae* there. Roman comedy depicts some *lenae* (Plautus, *Asinaria*, *Cistellaria*) and related women (slave advising promiscuity, overheard by lover (Plaut. *Most.* 181–247), drunken female slave of *leno* (*Curc.* 75–161, cf. *Pers.* 168–250)). But in Roman comedy the *leno* is much more prominent (contrast the rich development of the *lena* in Ariosto's comedy *La Lena*). Horace's witch Canidia, who speaks at length in *Epodes* 5 and 17, and his amorous old women in *Epodes* 8 and 12, relate to some aspects of A. Elegy has no interest in *lenones*; but Tibullus has some in a woman with power. In 1.5.47–60 a *lena* is hated by the speaker for deflecting Delia to a rich lover; he warns against the *sagae praecepta rapacis*. Tibullus' last, incomplete poem ends with a *lena*. In taking up precisely this figure when resuming love-elegy after Tibullus' death, P. acts like Tibullus' continuator (see Intro. section 2). Elegy is even more important to the poem than comedy.

The structure repeats that of 4.4: a female speech surrounded by male utterance. Again form is vital to interpretation. The poem is framed by the death of the *lena*, a kind of event alien to comedy, though envisaged obliquely in Herodas and Ovid. The beginning (1–4) and end (65–78) gesture towards epigram, funerary and dedicatory. The elegy seems to grow out of epigram, as if swollen by the narrator's indignation. His first passage (1–20) makes his involvement clear. The personal reasons for his hatred become plain near the end of the passage (17–18). The prime emphasis in 1–20 is on A.'s power in love; her immorality is seen too. The description as it develops ascribes magical skills to A.; such ascriptions, as the critical reader will be aware, need not be well-founded. They are ascribed to Delia by a disappointed mistress (Tib. 1.5.41–2), or to the defendant by a desperate orator (Cic. *Brut.* 217). The details of 9–18 lessen our confidence in the narrator; Ovid's remake picks this up (*Am.* 1.8.11, 14–15). Once the magic is questioned, the *lena* looks uncomfortably akin to elegiac poets: her power resembles their alleged power, even in its immorality. (Cf. K. S. Myers, *JRS* 86 (1996) 1–21.)

The central speech, unlike Tarpeia's, has an addressee to persuade and instruct. Its copiousness suggests both A.'s loquacity and her eloquence (loquacious *lenae* e.g. Plaut. *Cist.* 149, Apul. *Met.* 9.17.3). A spirited beginning on wealth and ending on youth enclose tricks for gaining money, tricks for keeping the lover

in subjection, and advice to prefer rich lovers. The speech in some ways looks like poetry by the elegists at their most didactic (cf. e.g. 1.10.21–30); the close (59–62) is particularly reminiscent of love-poetry. The speech, however, provides a sort of anti-love-poem, advocating exactly the ranking of money over love which the poets crusade against. A.'s textual occupation of the space which belonged in earlier books to the poet-narrator seems aggressive invasion, as with Horos. Within the poem the reader is to imagine the maddening effect of the speech for the narrator, who overhears it. Again this is intensified near the end, as the personal plot re-emerges (53–4, 57–8). If one views the poem as a whole oratorically, some of what A. is said to say sounds too bad to be true, as if the narrator's very report of direct speech cannot be relied on. The speech also deflates P.'s earlier poetry. Cynthia's passion for the narrator had been (for him) a matter of constant uncertainty. Her love of riches was often deplored, but her power and caprice had made her fascinating for him and the reader. Now her behaviour can be construed (by analogy, if she is not the addressee) as executing a manager's ideas, as embodying not her will but another's.

The final part (65–78) tells of A.'s death. In narrative terms, it offers a victory for the speaker, which he presents ideologically as a victory for love. A.'s likeness and unlikeness to the love-poet now becomes a proud contrast between their apparently similar obsequies, his (as seen in 2.13) deliberately restrained, hers squalid. Yet her abject poverty conflicts with the depiction of her power in 1–20: for it must be assumed success would bring her money. Her policies (21–62) were not such a danger after all. The ring between beginning and end (1–4, 75–8) underlines this conflict. The coherence of the narrator's depiction seems doubtful. His role as mere auditor of A.'s speech and mere spectator of her death serves to stress his own lack of dignity and power.

The black-tinted spectacles through which we are shown A. themselves display the subjective lover. A.'s speech often implies his errors within love. The dynamic central figure of the poem thus presents the world of elegy in a distorting mirror. The interaction between lover-poet and *lena* enables a vivacious and unexpected exploration of all P.'s previous work.

Some further points require mention. A.'s addressee is *nostrae . . . amicae* (63); she is not A.'s slave and has her own house and slaves. P., by not naming her either *Cynthia* or something else, must be calculatedly teasing the reader. 4.1.139–46 have stressed Cynthia's dominance in P.'s life; the last part of book 3 has shown us other girl-friends too (3.15, 20). We are bound to read the poem with the possibility very much in mind that this is Cynthia.

Is the poem set (a) before, (b) directly after, (c) some time after A.'s death? *animam in tegetes . . . expirare* (69, with n.) indicates her dying breath; the perfect in 70, and the dedication to Venus (65–6), confirm she is no more. So not (a). *sit tumulus . . . uetus amphora* (75) indicates that the tomb does not exist yet, and dictates interpretation of 77 *hoc bustum* (77–8n.). So not (c). (b) is supported by 3–4, where A.'s spirit seems to be just descending to Hades, and perhaps by 65–6, where

the dedication suggests a recent event. It would seem arbitrary to have a time not directly after the death but between funeral and burial (with *fuert* (Passerat) for Ω 's *fuert* in 71). 71–8 would most naturally form connected 'instructions' for both, *exsequiae fuert . . . sit tumulus . . .*, as in 2.13.17–36. For the perf. subj. wish with present meaning cf. 2.15.22, 23.22 *me iuerint* (further e.g. 1.15.29–31 (perf. = pres. subj.), 2.13.28 *nec fuert*). The tenses in 5–12, present in reference, must show the speaker's involvement, as if A. were still alive; the present tenses in 3.7.17–20 work similarly. For the future in 19 cf. Ov. *Met.* 12.400–1. 1–4 have already pointed to A.'s death.

Ovid, *Amores* 1.8 is remarkably similar to this poem in subject and form. Which came first? In book 4, where each poem is to seem startlingly original, P. is unlikely to have followed a recent elegist so closely. (The extant three-book edition of the *Amores* is probably later than this book: cf. *Am.* 1.14.45–6.) The differences still illuminate P.: thus *Am.* 1.8.5–18 are simply a description of magical skills, with little emphasis on love; Dipsas' speech begins with the rich lover, and does not reach precepts until its second half; she does not die. But to contrast a humorous *Am.* 1.8 with a passionate P. 4.5 would be to miss the humour in 4.5 (cf. e.g. 35–6, 37–8nn.) and the detachment of the poem from the narrator.

Some discussions: G. Luck, *Hermes* 83 (1955) 428–38; E. Courtney, *BICS* 16 (1969) 70–87; Hubbard (1974) 136–42; K. Morgan, *Ovid's art of imitation* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 47, 1977) 59–68; K. J. Gutzwiller, *Ramus* 14 (1985) 105–115; G. Puccioni in *Studi di poesia latina in onore di Antonio Taglia* (Rome 1979) II 609–23; P. Fedeli in R. Renato (ed.), *Rappresentazioni della morte* (Urbino 1987) 91–129; J. C. Yardley, *PCPS* 33 (1987) 179–89; J. C. McKeown, *Ovid: Amores* (Liverpool 1987–) II 198–201; K. S. Myers, *JRS* 86 (1996) 1–21; K. N. O'Neill, *CJ* 94 (1998–9) 49–80; Heyworth (1999) 86–92; M. W. Dickie, *Magic and magicians in the Greco-Roman world* (London 2001) 193–4; Janan (2001) ch. 5, and in E. Spentzou and D. Fowler (edd.), *Cultivating the Muse* (Oxford 2002) 187–206; Rambaux (2001) 290–2; Wyke (2002) 99–103; S. L. James, *Learned girls and male persuasion* (Berkeley 2003) 52–68; DeBrohun (2003) 151–2.

1–4 The poem begins, like 4.4, with a tomb (*sepulcrum* ends the first line of each). It also begins, as poem 4 ended, with a hostile address to the dead woman. But that ending was severe; this opening is embittered.

1 The hate-filled address reverses kindly addresses to the dead, such as Tib. 2.4.49–50 *placideque quiescas, | terraque securae sit super ossa levis*. The earth is desired, not to lie lightly on the deceased (a very common wish in Latin and Greek epitaphs), or adorn the tomb with flowers (Philod. *AP* 7.222.7–8 (*GP* 3326–7)), but to cover it with thorns. This will show no one cares about A.; it will make the stone inaccessible and illegible (cf. Zenod. *AP* 7.315.1–2 (*HE* 3640–1), Heges. *AP* 7.320.1–2 (*HE* 1931–2), Cic. *Tusc.* 5.64–6). The reference to thorns will gain malevolent force when A.'s name is revealed (63). Possible too is allusion to a

thorny shrub called *dipsas* ('thirsty one'; Theophr. *HP* 4.7.1) – or a witty Ovidian reading of P. (cf. E. Courtney, *BICS* 16 (1969) 80–1).

2 For *lenae* as keen on drink, cf. Hdas 1.86–7, Plaut. *As.* 799–802, *Cist.* 149 *multibiba* (Curc. 76–140 *leno's ianitrix*), Ov. *Am.* 1.8.3–4 (his *Dipsas*' name explained).

Something more pointed is required than *quod non uis*: it is self-evident that no person or ghost would want to feel thirst. Possibly something cruel like *quod potius*, 'what is more desirable' (to me than the obscuring of your grave, because particularly unwelcome to you). Perhaps not *perpetuam* (Heyworth, cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.8.113–14 *di tibi dent . . . perpetuamque sitim*): it is questionable whether Ovid would end his poem with words taken unaltered from P.'s start.

3 *nec sedeant cineri manes* 'when you are ashes, may your dead spirit not sit still', i.e. be doomed to restless motion. Cf. *AE* 2000 no. 176 *ita sint quieti cineribus manes tui*, *CIL* v 6128.7. *cineri* is possessive dative. The conception of the afterlife changes abruptly in the next phrase.

3–4 *ultor* and the context suggest special treatment for A. as she enters Hades, not merely the alarming effect of Cerberus' barking on all the dead (Virg. *Aen.* 6.400–1). Cf. 3.18.23 *exoranda canis tria sunt latrantia colla*; an untroubled encounter with Cerberus is requested for Oedipus at Soph. *OC* 1568–78. Cerberus attacks ghosts at 4.11.25.

A.'s terror shows her new lack of power. *ossa* paradoxically undercuts for the reader the treatment of the dead person as a conscious being: it depicts her as a mere annihilated body. Cf. 4.7.94, 11.14, and e.g. 2.13.58 *mea quid poterunt ossa minuta loqui*?

5–20 The poem develops into third-person description of the dead person, a common form in epitaph, but here vehemently polemical.

5 *docta . . . mollire* 'with the skill to soften', i.e. incline to love. P.'s own type of poetry is characteristically *mollis* (cf. e.g. 1.7.19, 2.1.2); love-elegy like A. makes the *durus* amorous (Ov. *Rem.* 763–6). *docta* creates a further link with the poet.

Hippolytum: the extreme example of male chastity. Cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* 2.4.32 *illic Hippolytum pone, Priapus erit*, his *duritiam* *Her.* 4.85. But *Veneri* gestures more specifically to Euripides' extant *Hippolytus*, where Aphrodite is his enemy (for the two *Hippolytus* plays see now P. Oxy. 4640, G. O. Hutchinson, *ZPE* 149 (2004) 15–28). *negantem* + dat. suggests metaphorically an amorous proposition by Venus herself, not by the stepmother Phaedra (through her nurse in Euripides' extant *Hippolytus*); cf. 2.32.60 (Danae) *non potuit magno casta negare Ioui*, *OLD* s.v. *nego* 3c. This makes the refusal more remarkable, the clash of names stronger.

6 *concordique* carries some suggestion of marriage, the usual context for this word in relation to couples: cf. e.g. Cat. 66.87–8 *o nuptae, semper concordia uestras . . . sedes incolat*, *CIL* I² 1220.3, 5, 1732.6, Ov. *Met.* 7.752, 8.708 *concordes egimus annos*.

pessima . . . auis 'a very bad omen'. Cf. e.g. Cat. 61.19–20 *cum bono . . . alite*, Hor. *C.* 1.15.5 *mala . . . aui* (both of marriages). Here A. is herself the bad omen; for this conception, cf. Aesch. fr. 95 Radt 'I do not make you the omen (*lit.*

bird) of my journey'. *Acanthis* 63 may add a mocking reference here to the bird ἄκανθις – melodious (Theocr. 7.141 etc.) and hence poet-like.

7 Penelopen quoque matches *uel Hippolytum*, and exemplifies 6. Penelope is the extreme instance of the faithful wife: 2.9a.3–8, 3.12.23–38, 13.10, 24. As on Hippolytus, P. evokes a famous work: 7–8 recall a leading suitor from the *Odyssey* and its actual events; for *rumore* cf. e.g. Hom. *Od.* 19.268–307 (Penelope disbelieves it). P., and A., again rewrite the plot: Penelope would be actually compelled to remarry, and not by the suitors but by love. This is different from the cynicism on Penelope herself seen at e.g. Lyc. 771–3, Hor. *Sat.* 2.5.75–83, Ov. *Am.* 1.8.47–8. Lustful *Antinoo* at the end of the couplet contrasts with the chaste name at the beginning, and with *mariti* at the end of the hexameter. *mariti* itself clashes with *nubere* at the start of 8.

9–10 Magic is now more definitely suggested. Again A. resembles the love-poet, who claims he can both instil and heal desire (1.10.15–18, Ov. *Rem.* 43–4).

The magnet and the iron are portrayed as lovers in Ach. Tat. 1.17.2 (cf. *duco* 'marry'). P.'s educated reader will surely recall that magnets can also repel (Lucr. 6.1042–55; cf. also Posid. 17 A–B). That fact rather undermines this wondrous suspension of a wonder (*poterit* . . . *non*, will actually be able not to).

uelit: here as at 11 *mouerit* the subjunctive, positing a hypothesis, forms a conditional clause without *si* (H–S 656–7). Cf. e.g. Ov. *AA* 2.650 (a branch) *concutiat tenerum quaelibet aura, cadet*; Tib. 1.6.53 *attigerit, labentur opes*, Ov. *Rem.* 506 *ueneris et fuerit ianua clausa, feres*.

nidis 'nestlings', cf. Virg. *Aen.* 12.475, Montan. fr. 1.3 Courtney. Mother birds as models of selfless affection: Hom. *Il.* 9.323–4, Hor. *Epod.* 1.17–22, Virg. *Aen.* 12.473–7. On stepmothers, cf. 4.11.88n.

11–12 The washing away of unharvested crops is the result (12); cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* 3.7.31 *carmine laesa Ceres*, and for *stantia*, technical but in contrast with *currenti*, e.g. Paul. *Dig.* 47.2.26.1 *qui fructus stantes subriperit*. The means (11) is more obscure. *mouerit* is inappropriate for a handful of herbs (one could read say *in fossa soluerit*, with magical correspondence to *diluarentur*). The *fossa* is strange: trenches would be used in magic to receive blood, not herbs; a trench for sacrifice next to a cauldron for boiling (Shackleton Bailey) leaves a complicated picture unexplained. The ditch might be a drainage-ditch; spoiling it would cause the crops to be washed away. Herbs from the Quirinal hill (*OLD* s.v. *Collinus*² a) might be added to it, though *ad fossam mouerit* would still be curious. Or P. might be adapting a further magic accomplishment, moving crops between fields (cf. Piso fr. 43 Forsythe, Virg. *Ecl.* 8.99, Tib. 1.8.19, Ov. *Rem.* 255; *Her.* 6.88 (moves woods and rocks)). A. would move to a drainage-ditch the grass from a hill (*collinas*; *OLD* s.v. *herba* 2), and so flood the crops. For draining ditches cf. e.g. Varro *RR* 1.29.2; *RS* 25 CIII 15–17 *neue e<a>s fossas | opturato* ('block') *neue opsaepilo, quo minus suo itinere aqua | ire fluere possit*.

13–14 A preliminary clause assigns some general magical arts to A. by the way, before P. turns to specific actions connected with love. Power over the Moon is a

well-worn attribute of witches (cf. e.g. 1.1.19; Ar. *Clouds* 749–50; Hor. *Epod.* 17.77–8). *leges imponere* raises A.'s power to a conqueror's (Livy 9.3.11 etc.); but, in combination with *audax* 'with the audacity to', the words also show her breach of hierarchy (cf. e.g. Hor. *C.* 1.3.25 for the inf.). *leges* alliterates forcefully with the vanquished goddess.

fallere terga lupo 'disguise herself as a wolf': by magic (cf. 14) rather than with a skin, though turning oneself into a wolf seems elsewhere to be the prerogative of men (cf. Virg. *Ecl.* 8.97 (the magical Moeris), Petr. 62.4–14). For the use of *fallo* see Housman (1972) II 521, III 1236, and on Man. 1.240; for *lupo* 'with the form of a wolf' Shackleton Bailey 211. Animal backs are more prominent, to humans, than human backs; the phrase highlights the grotesque change to all fours (for which cf. [Eur.] *Rhes.* 211–12, Dolon on his disguise as a wolf).

15–16 The alleged action in 16 rests on the analogy typical of magic: control over human sight is given through control over non-human sight. But it may strike the reader as amusingly unlikely: A. is meant to literalize the proverbial *cornici oculum* (Cic. *Flac.* 46, cf. *Mur.* 25 with Quint. *Inst.* 8.3.22; A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (Leipzig 1890) 93), i.e. outwitting a wise person, piercing the eye of a crow, which itself is sharp-sighted and itself attacks eyes (so Sch. Bob. Cic. *Flac.* 46 p. 104 Stangl). It is as if A.'s supposed magic act were literally, say, using a sprat to catch a mackerel. *posset* and *astu* might suggest the magic is over-determination for this crafty woman. The basic action in 15 strongly recalls the claims of love-poets: cf. esp. 3.3.49–50 (Muse speaking): P's elegy will teach *qui uolet austeros arte ferire uiros*; cf. also Tib. 1.6.9–16, Ov. *Tr.* 2.461–2 (claim about Tibullus).

intentos suggests a close watch; cf. 1.3.19–20 *intentis . . . oculis*, like Argus.

17–18 give the reader new cause to suspect distorting partiality in the narrator. It emerges that he sees himself as an object of A.'s sorcery. *nostro* begins, *me* ends, the second half of the hexameter. A. did not favour the unremunerative poet (53–4, 57–8), and hence allegedly sought his death. Not even a direct attempt on the narrator's life is claimed, only preliminaries.

In perverted augury, A. 'consulted owls'; cf. Ov. *F.* 1.180 *uisam primum consulit augur auem*. These birds are associated with night and death (3.6.29 *per busta*, Hor. *Epod.* 5.20 *nocturnae*, Sen. *Med.* 733–4). For the short syllable before *str-* cf. 4.4.8n.

This type of *hippomanes* is a secretion from mares' genitals 'like semen' (Aristot. *Hist. An.* 572a25–9). Here, as at Virg. *G.* 3.280–3, the mare is pregnant, and the substance endangers life.

19–20 are hopelessly corrupt. They do not look like an introduction to the speech, so something may be missing too. See A. Kershaw, *Latomus* 57 (1998) 105–8; Heyworth (1999) 87–9.

21–8 A.'s opening loudly sets out her immoral premises. The structure is relentless: a long series of 'if' clauses, subdivided into pairs, runs over three couplets (the abundant enticements of luxury); it is forcefully succeeded by three unjoined main clauses in one line (27), which are summed up in another (28).

The geographical range of modern luxury is marked by the proper names; import, manufacture and the East are stressed. The range is a recurring concern of Latin literature, not least in relation to women, who want precious imports to enhance their beauty (cf. e.g. 2.16.17–18, 3.13.5–8, Tib. 2.4.27–30; for the attitude Ov. *Med.* 17–22, *AA* 3.129–32, Pliny *NH* 22.3). The theme is also integral to book 4.

21 The irremediable corruption of 19–20 continues to *doro-zantum*. We would expect to have heard of the Dorozantes if they existed; *Eoa . . . aurea ripa* is an unlikely sequence of epithets; the metre adds to our suspicions (no third-foot caesura, with no strong second-foot caesura, or elision or minor word-end at the end of the second foot (*ab* and *in* at the end of the second foot 4.7.5, 8.63)). No satisfactory correction is close enough to the MSS to be compelling. Clearly there is some reference to an ornament of distant origin. Cf. G. P. Goold in J. N. Grant (ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin Texts* (New York 1989) 102–3, Heyworth (1999) 89–90.

22 The shellfish *murex* used in Tyre and Sidon to produce purple dye for clothes. Cf. e.g. Tib. 2.4.28 *Tyrio murice tingit ouem. superbit* transfers to the mollusc the pride of the woman wearing the purple: cf. e.g. Ov. *AA* 3.103 *forma quota quaeque superbit?*, Livy 34.3.9, 4.14 *‘cur non insignis auro et purpura conspicior?’* A moralizing point is suggested to the reader: it is really human vanity that confers this significance on objects once hidden, now found by human greed and daring (cf. Pliny *NH* 22.3; there may be play in *super-*, cf. *sub*).

23 Silks from Cos have strong associations with elegiac poetry: see 4.2.23–4n. Cos is often called the city of Eurypylus (Hom. *Il.* 2.677, Hermesianax fr. 7.75–6 Powell, Ov. *Met.* 7.363); *Mineruae* is a metonym for weaving (2.9.5, Virg. *Aen.* 8.409). But the two together may suggest the contrasting world of myth. Heracles invaded Cos when Eurypylus ruled it; in one version (*SH* 903A) Athena, who helped him, made her aegis from a Coan enemy’s skin.

Eurypyliue: nom. adj. An unwieldy line would result from two genitive names (*Eurypyli*, *Mineruae*) dependent on one noun, to which a further adjectival name is attached.

24 Figures to be sewn on to clothes (cf. Ov. *AA* 3.131, with Gibson’s n.) are cut from Pergamene bed-coverings. They are made from material into which gold has been woven, a technique supposedly invented by Attalus III of Pergamum (Pliny *NH* 8.196 etc.; he reigned 138–133 BC). For such figures in Attalid Pergamum see the griffin on the valance of a couch in a sculpture, C. L. Ransom, *Couches and beds of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans* (Chicago 1905) 96–7, pl. IV. Cf. for such coverings Plaut. *Ps.* 146–7, Varro *Men.* fr. 434 Cèbe. One would expect *Attalico* to denote the style rather than the actual owner (so e.g. *Attalico . . . toro* 2.13.22), even though coverlets did form part of Attalus’ bequest to Rome (Varro *Vit. Pop. R.* fr. 415 Salvatore). But *putria* ‘decaying’ would be too intrusive a narratorial focalization, against A.’s own rhetoric. Perhaps *uiuida* (Heyworth) or *lucida* (Hutchinson): cf. Stat. *Theb.* 9.332–3 (a shield embossed with figures) *auro* | *lucidus*.

25 Possibly Egyptian crystal cups (Mart. 12.74.1–2), or imports from Egyptian Thebes using the ‘Theban’ stone, sometimes treated as precious (Pliny *NH* 33.68 *Thebaico aliisque . . . gemmis*).

26 murreaque: on the bright and precious *murra* (fluor-spar?), found specially in Parthia, see Pliny *NH* 37.18–22. This aspect of the Parthians surprises after their role as foe in 4.3. The woman seems to be envisaged as throwing parties herself (cf. 2.16.5).

27–8 Love in elegy rests theoretically on the mutual *fides* of the pair; they even swear oaths of loyalty by the gods. But these oaths are always being violated (e.g. 1.15.33–42, 2.28.5–8; Hor. *Epod.* 15.1–11); perhaps the gods themselves may not be too bothered (e.g. Call. *Ep.* 25 Pfeiffer; Ov. *Am.* 1.8.85–6, cf. P. 2.16.47–8). Yet a principle of faithlessness and oath-breaking is more shocking than continual lapses.

prouolue ‘hurl out headlong’; stronger than ‘reject’ or Ar. *Clouds* 1477 ‘I threw out (ἐξέβαλον) the gods.

uincant: perhaps as if in a general debate or law-case between *fides* and falsehood.

frange ‘breach’, cf. Cic. *Fam.* 12.14.6 (from P. Lentulus Spinther son of *cos.* 57) *leges Antonias fregi*; it may have too some shade of ‘destroy’. *iura* is ‘law-code’ (*OLD*s.v. 3a). One could read *frangeque* (Hutchinson), if *et* seems worrying, because of the irregular pattern *x, y et z*, or because postponed *et* does not elsewhere in P. follow an imperative or an elided trochee (Heyworth). Cf. for *-ëque* 2.14.26, 3.21.13.

Pudicitiae: a resounding polysyllabic close. *iura* and *deos* suggest personification here. P. twice mentions the temple(s) of Pudicitia: 1.16.2, 2.6.25; cf. *LTUR* IV 168–9; Juv. 6.1–20 (Pudicitia personified). *damnosae* ‘financially ruinous’ is more usually applied to Venus and love (Plaut. *Bac.* 115–17, Hor. *Epist.* 1.18.21).

29 joins on to 28 (and 27) with a devious twist: even a pretence of adultery can help profits. *causis* ‘excuses’ (cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* 1.8.74 *quae causas praebeat Isis erit*) implies not a mere rival but someone with a prior claim, most obviously a husband. His imaginary movements will readily supply excuses. Cf. e.g. 2.23.20 ‘*hodie uir mihi rure uenit*’. Promises of a night of love are often broken to the elegiac lover (e.g. 2.17.1–2, Tib. 1.8.63–4). Ovid depicts strategies of pretended infidelity (*Am.* 2.19.13–14), and of delay (*AA* 3.437–4, 752 *maxima lena mora est*). A. is more flagrantly financial.

pretium facit ‘creates value’, cf. Pliny *NH* 33.5 (substances) *quibus pretium faceret ipsa fragilitas*.

31–2 ‘If he happens to disorder your hair (in anger), his anger is profitable; later he should be crushed, and reconciliation paid for.’ Spoiling the woman’s elaborate coiffure is seen as one of the milder versions of lovers’ violence (coupled with tearing clothes, Tib. 1.10.61–2; Ov. *AA* 2.169–72); see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.8.11–12 for more examples.

A. leaves the identity of the man casually unspecified.

utilis ira: cynical paradox; cf. Luc. 1.182 *multis utile bellum*. The theme of expediency is continued from *utere* (29).

mercata: pass. in sense, though *mercor* is dep.; cf. 1.2.5 *mercato . . . cultu*, 4.6.72, 7.55nn.

33–4 denique: a further example of trickery (*simules*, cf. *simulare* 29). No doubt the delay will be remunerative (on the principle of 30); but the prominence of the narrator ensures the reader thinks of the comic frustration for the male. Particularly recalled are the complaints in 2.33*a* of Cynthia's chaste nocturnal worship of Isis.

Venerem: a metonymy, in effective contrast with the actual Isis (similarly *Venerem* contrasts with Vesta and Isis at Ov. *AA* 3.463–6).

The huge enthusiasm and interest excited by Isis is shown not only by elegy (Tib. 1.3.23–32, Ov. *Am.* 2.13.7–18 etc.) but by archaeology, e.g. her important temple at Pompeii (*Alla ricerca di Iside* (Rome 1992)). For the cult and women see S. E. Heyob, *The cult of Isis among women in the Graeco-Roman world* (Leiden 1975). Mention of the cult makes a contrast with 4.1.17 *nulli cura fuit externos quaerere diuos*.

35–6 The thought of deceit about days leads to a further thought. Birthdays were important (Cynthia's in 3.10); presents were expected (Plaut. *Ps.* 775–8, Ov. *AA* 1.405–18). Dipsas too advises feigning a birthday to get gifts (Ov. *Am.* 1.8.93–4). *Idus* is to be understood from *Idibus* with *Apriles*; cf. the easier Mart. 9.52.2–3 *natales . . . tuas Apriles | ut nostras amo Martias Kalendas*. The second girl's different, but emphatic, story extorts more presents the following month. There seems no evidence that *Kalendas* can be understood with *Apriles*, as editors wish (1 April was a day for gifts to women, Ov. *AA* 1.405–6). Nor would any cunning be involved, as in the other suggestions of 31–40. Aptly, 13 April belongs to Jupiter Victor, 15 May to Mercury.

ingerat, tundat humorously indicate constant, emphatic repetition. Cf. e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 12.11 (*Epicurum tibi ingerere*), Tac. *Dial.* 7.4 (*nomina . . . liberis ingerunt*). *tibi* denotes the girl: mentions of her birthday are handily overheard by the man.

In such a context, actual slaves' names are expected. The slaves' names should be in use; so *Iole* (Ω; cf. e.g. *CIL* vi 20535.2) is preferable to *Hyale* (Palmer). It also evokes myth: Hercules fell for Iole. *A/Omicle* is seriously corrupt, like the name *Isidos* in 34 (*sideris* Ω).

37–8 This trick, like that in 39–40, is not (directly) for profit. His sitting imploringly at her feet seems to be comically matched by her sitting comfortably in a chair. However, his pose does not suit supplicants of humans as opposed to divine statues; so perhaps *adeat* (Heinsius) or *fleat* (Hutchinson), with a desirable subjunctive (9–10n.). He must be indoors like her, to see her write. He fears she is arranging to meet a rival: for such fears founded on letter-writing cf. Plaut. *As.* 762–7, Ov. *Am.* 3.14.31, *AA* 2.543 etc.

cathedra: a comfortable chair, particularly used by women (*OLD* s.v. a).

quidlibet: anticlimactic enjambement. Ov. *AA* 3.608 *iuuenem trepidum quolibet abde loco* likewise marks pretence (the danger is a sham).

has artes si pauet ille, tenes: cf. Ov. *AA* 3.594 *has artes* (arousing jealousy) *tolle, senescet amor*. Fear about fidelity helps, and shows, love, cf. Ov. *AA* 2.445–50.

39–40 Love-bites, unusually visible clues to love-making, form part of elegy's games with knowledge. In 3.8.21–2 the speaker wants his rivals to see them; at Tib. 1.6.13–14 there are ways to hide them; they arouse suspicion at Ov. *Am.* 1.8.97–8, 3.14.33–4. The pentameter reveals A.'s special deviousness: these are pretend love-bites.

dentibus (Heinsius): elegiac quarrels (*litibus* Ω) do not involve biting. Nor would *alternis* (N ∧ p.o.) have any clear point with *litibus* (answering speeches?). *alterius* (ΠJ), with *dentibus*, is ideal for jealousy: cf. e.g. 2.8.5 *possum ego in alterius positam spectare lacerto?*, Ov. *Rem.* 771–2 (he loved her more) *esse quod alterius coeperat illa uiri. quos putet* states a purpose.

41–4 A.'s use of exempla is made more interesting by her complex relation to the narrator-poet. His discourse had brought her into the world of myth, and of tragedy and epic (5–8). Hers turns myth into everyday material, and rejects myth and tragedy for comedy, with an explicit emphasis on that genre and commendation of the 'modern' culture it reflects (cf. 43 *mundi* 'refined' and *pretiosa* 'expensive'). Both examples are used by P. (Medea 2.34.8 *secuta* etc.; *Menandreae* . . . *Thaidos* 2.6.3–4); but the latter is abnormal in P., and not approved by the narrator in 2.6. A. thus distorts P.

41–2 'Do not be attracted by the insults of Medea, who so eagerly followed Jason; of course she met with scorn when she had had the audacity to approach the man first.' Medea's furious reproaches are not a good model (Eur. *Med.* 465–98 etc.); they were merely the outcome of her foolish display of longing, which lost her her control and Jason's interest. No sympathy is shown for Medea, whom Jason decided to divorce after her help and flight to Greece with him; contrast 2.21.11–12, 24b.45–6. Nor is horror shown at her fratricide or infanticide (contrast 3.19.17–18): *ausa* is reserved for her flouting, not even of social norms, but of basic strategy. (The convention was for the man to request the sexual favours: Ov. *Am.* 1.8.43–4 *ipsa rogat* (meant to surprise), *AA* 1.277–8 *femina* . . . *partes* . . . *rogantis agat*). The language of the pentameter assimilates the affair to the ordinary elegiac and contemporary world. Cf. 2.14.13 *fastus* . . . *iniquos*, 3.25.15 *fastus patiare superbos; rogo* absolute in this sense is idiomatic, presumably everyday.

43–4 The prologue of Menander's *Thais* (fr. 163 K–A) depicted the cunning courtesan, 'persuasive . . . shutting out, often asking, loving no one, always pretending to'. Her 'tricking' even the class of clever slave recalls A. herself (15). (The plural creates a class; cf. e.g. 3.9.31–2 *magno aequabunt ista Camillos | iudicia*.) Γέτας (i.e. the Getan, cf. Men. *Asp.* 243–4) is a common slave-name in Menander; but P.'s depiction of the slave probably assimilates to Roman comedy. Cf. A. Traill, *Phoenix* 55 (2001) 284–301. For *ferio* 'trick', cf. 3.3.50 *austeros arte ferire uiros* (of what P.'s poetry will help lovers do); it may allude to Ter. *Ph.* 46–7 *Geta | ferietur alio munere* ('will be stung for', a somewhat different use).

moecha stresses immorality; not ‘adulteress’ (nor at e.g. *Phaed. App.* 3.10).

45–6 should probably be deleted (Hutchinson). Not only do they lack connection with what precedes or follows, but they do not suit the speech as a whole. In general the woman, far from adopting the man’s behaviour, is independent, and often dominant. Getting drunk with him and joining in his rowdy singing suggests a quite different approach. All the other commands enjoin trickery or getting money or both. Goold (edition, cf. (1966) 82) swaps the lines with 29–30; but the notes above on 29–34 show that 29–30 are well-bound to their context. Without that transposition, *uiri* becomes a suspicious pointer: it could simply mean ‘the man’, i.e. ‘him’, but it looks like the filling in of what is elsewhere a carefully unspecified ‘he’. *i comes* somewhat awkwardly combines *i et iunge* (‘go on, join’) with *i comes* (‘go together with’, as in the literal *it or ire comes* at e.g. *Virg. Aen.* 6.159, *Ov. Met.* 10.173).

47–8 The emphasis in 47–58 is on the priority of money. *dantes* links well to *pretiosa* in 43; the refusal to admit without payment contrasts effectively with the behaviour of Medea condemned in 41–2. *Tib.* 2.4.21–42 dwell on the idea that money alone will enable the lover to get past the mistress’s door. The familiar scene of the lover at the door (4.9.33–50n.) is here elaborated with the contemporary figure of the door-keeper. He is popular with Ovid (*Am.* 1.6, *AA* 2.255–6, 3.587–8), but omitted from the closely connected *Am.* 1.8.77 *surda sit oranti tua ianua, laxa ferenti*. That couplet and this were written together in *CIL* IV 1893–4 (tab. XXV.7; found in Basilica at Pompeii).

inanis ‘someone empty-handed’.

in obductam somniet usque seram ‘let him dream throughout the night on to the bolt placed to block entry’. The door-keeper’s head has fallen against the door in sleep. But Markland’s abl. with *in* ‘on’ is easier (cf. e.g. 3.15.16 *caput in dura ponere iussit humo*), Kenney’s *ad* ‘beside’ easier still. The corruption would be very early, cf. *CIL* IV 1894.

49–50 The soldier is a significant elegiac figure. His violence makes him notionally the antithesis of the narrator, and in theory disagreeable to women; but booty makes him rich. He goes back to comedy, e.g. *Plaut. Epid.* 299–301 (rich, in love), *Miles*, Terence, *Eunuchus* (Thraso). *Ov. Am.* 3.8.9–22 urge the horror of such a lover; *AA* 2.715–16 see his attraction. The sailor, who gains wealth by travel, contrasts with the poor and stay-at-home lover (cf. e.g. 3.7 for greedy sea-travel set against love). For merchant-captains and women see Herodas 2, with Headlam and Knox’s edn. xxxix–xl; *Hor. C.* 3.6.31–2 *navis . . . magister; | dedecorum pretiosus emptor*. A. presents a negative picture in 49–50, perhaps forestalling objections or stressing her point; but her language is also shaped by the narrator-poet, as 51–2 confirm.

attrita: cf. 4.3.24 *atterit hasta manus?* Hands are made ugly by work (*Sen. Vit. B.* 7.3), and especially rowing (*Ar. Wasps* 1119); not that captains would really row.

51–2 describe wealthy freedmen, vividly recalling their earlier sale as foreign slaves. They bore a notice describing them (Gel. 4.2.1). Their feet were whitened to show that they were foreign: cf. Tib. 2.3.59–60 a successful rival *quem saepe coegit | barbara gypsatos ferre catasta* (the platform they stood on) *pedes*, Pliny *NH* 35.199, Juv. 1.111. They had to show their fitness: cf. with *saluere* 2.16.27 (a successful rival who once) *barbarus exutis agitat uestigia lumbis*; Men. fr. 150 K–A. These lines remind us of the love-poets' invectives; cf. also e.g. Hdas. 2.37–8 (the rich lover allegedly once a slave). Women, and men, could be thought attracted even to actual slaves (cf. e.g. Herodas 5, Petr. 126.5, 9–10; Ovid, *Amores* 2.8, despite 2.7.21–2).

53 A climactic utterance. *aurum* encloses the line: it alone matters. Love-elegists employ such devices to convey disapproval of money: cf. 3.13.48–50 | *aurum . . . | auro pulsa fides, auro uenalia iura*, | *aurum . . .*, Tib. 1.9.17–18, Ov. *AA* 2.276–7 | *aurea . . . auro* | . . . *auro conciliatur amor*. Again A. is made to invert the narrator's values.

manus: a resumption of 50 *attrita si ferat aera manu*. For the comic practicality cf. Ar. *Plut.* 1018–19 (Old Woman) 'He (a young lover) said I'd got utterly beautiful hands.' (Chremylus) 'Yes, whenever they held out twenty drachmas.'

54 Poetry is suddenly introduced; the narrator's involvement becomes clear. The couplet confirms poets' sad comments that money is now more use in love than poetry: Call. fr. 193, Ov. *AA* 2.273–80, cf. Tib. 1.4.57–70.

uersibus, distorted to *uerba*, contemptuously matches *aurum . . . aurum* (cf. Plaut. *As.* 524–5 *an tu tibi | uerba blanda esse aurum rere . . . ?*). *uerba feres* plays on the idiom *uerba dare* 'deceive'; *uerba* in this idiom plays on poetic words at 2.24.8, Ov. *AA* 2.166.

[55–6] = 1.2.1–2. Probably a marginal quotation which has entered the text. If the lines were a mocking citation by A., one would expect a *talia* or the like to pick them up explicitly; whereas 57 takes up the argument of 54 effectively, now opposing *uersus* to *uestis*. A pointed picking up of *Coa ueste* in 57 would demand *Coam uestem* rather than *Coae munera uestis*. Citation of P., and identification of Cynthia, would seem painfully unsubtle on the author's part. Such repetitions of text are frequently spurious. *CIL* iv 1893–4 (47–8n.) shows the popularity of this general passage, and juxtaposes lines from elsewhere.

57 'who gives verses, but not gifts of Coan silk'; this takes up the item in 21–6 particularly associated with Cynthia. 1.2.1–2, arguing against luxury, are reversed; no less important is the play with 2.1.6 (if she wears Coan silks) *totum de* ('about' and 'made from'; *hoc totum e* Ω) *Coa ueste uolumen erit*. Sarcastic allusion to P.'s text by A. would, as with 55–6, be unsubtle of P.; but the reader is at least invited to an alternative construction too: 'who gives verses, not gifts, of Coan silk' (cf. Philetas of Cos 3.1.1). See G. Jachmann, *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Königstein 1981) 462–9, Heyworth (1986) 209–10.

58 surda sine arte 'unlistened to, without skill'. *surdus*, like κωφός, can mean 'unheard' (pass.) as well as 'unhearing'. Cf. e.g. Pers. 6.28 (*uota*), Juv. 7.71 *surda nihil gemitet graue bucina. sine arte* elaborates and explains *surda*: cf. Ov. *Tr.* 3.10.75 *aspiceres nudos sine fronde sine arbore campos. sine aere* (Π), if adjectival

(‘moneyless’), would be detached from *surda* and not predicative, and so awkward; as a further condition (‘if he does not give money’) it would be clumsily repetitious. Aesthetics are similarly perverted at Ov. *Am.* 1.8.61 *qui dabit, ille tibi magno sit maior Homero*.

59–60 *Lenae* and the like urge women not to limit themselves by loyalty while they still have youth (Hdas 1.37–8, 62–3, Plaut. *Most.* 201–2, 216–17); elegiac narrators urge them to love before age and death (so 2.15.49–54, Tib. 1.1.69–74, both near the end of poems, as these lines are near the end of A.’s speech). The kinship of the two topics is uneasy for the love-elegist. For *uti* cf. esp. Tib. 1.8.47–8 *dum primi floret tibi temporis aetas, | utere*; Ov. *F.* 5.353 (Flora) *monet aetatis specie dum floreat uti*. But A.’s *utere* (i.e. *sanguine* and *anno*) resumes the coldly practical *utere* of 29.

Young people have a spring-like vigour, while their blood is unimpaired (e.g. Plaut. *Merc.* 550 *quom est sanguis integer*; Cat. 68a.16 *cum aetas florida uer ageret*). The unusual *annus* instead of *anni* perhaps continues the idea of life as a year. 60 strikingly turns from the year to the day (*annus* | . . . *dies* |); the very next day may ‘take a little from your beauty’ (cf. e.g. Lucr. 3.213 *nil . . . libatum de . . .*). This is less extreme than the love-poet’s exhortation ‘tomorrow we may die’ (2.15.53–4); it inverts the syntax of *carpe diem* (Hor. *C.* 1.11.8).

61–2 The brevity of flowers is commonly used to argue the brevity of beauty (e.g. Tib. 1.4.29, Ov. *AA* 2.115–16, *F.* 5.354 *contemni spinam cum cecidere rosae*). A. adds to the effect. She presents whole rose-gardens (cf. Ov. *AA* 3.67 *uiolaria*; Ov. *Tr.* 5.2.23; *rosaria* have countless flowers). The roses do not, as expected, flower at morning and die naturally at evening, cf. *De Rosis* e.g. 45–6; *CIL* VI 22377.2 (rose withers) *certo tempore . . . suo*. Rather they die at what should be a cool time, before reaching their full bloom, prematurely ‘baked’ by the hottest of winds (Sen. *NQ* 4a.2.18).

uidi ego: A. draws on experience with authority, like an elegiac or didactic poet (cf. Virg. *G.* 1.193 *uidi equidem*; Tib. 1.2.89, Ov. *Am.* 2.12.25, *Tr.* 2.143, all | *uidi ego*).

uictura ‘would have surpassed’; cf. Ov. *Ex P.* 2.4.28 *Paestanas uinct odor rosas* (Paestum in Lucania). ‘Which would otherwise have lived’ seems too obvious, and much weaker rhetoric. *odoratum . . . Paestum* (Schippers) gives more easily intelligible syntax than the gen.; the phrase still evokes the Virgilian *rosaria Paesti* (*G.* 4.119). Cf. Heyworth (1999) 90–1. For the fut. partic. cf. e.g. Ov. *Met.* 1.525–6 *plura locuturum . . . fugit*.

63–5 The bones are A.’s. It turns out, and may have been indicated at 17–20, that the narrator was eavesdropping: the situation in Ov. *Am.* 1.8.21–2, 109. His contemplation of her aged body takes up, maliciously, her point on the decline of beauty. *Acanthis* plays on ἀκανθα ‘thorn’: all that is left after the rose (61); cf. 61–2n., Ov. *AA* 3.68 *hac mihi de spina grata corona data est*. There will hardly be a contrast between her old body (64) and her death (65–70); she is almost a skeleton (cf. Posid. 95.8 A–B). Rather, *sed* marks a movement from the past to the present,

where action is required. Cf., to a god, 4.2.55 *sed facias, diuum sator, ut* . . . (near end; cf. the closing ‘but (ἀλλά) receive’ to gods, Call. *Ep.* 33.2 Pfeiffer, Argent. *AP* 6.246.7 (*GP* 1391)); 7.71 *sed tibi nunc mandata damus*; Virg. *Aen.* 6.629 *sed iam age, carpe uiam*.

The narrator’s bones are less likely. He can hardly lose weight instantly in response to her words. If this is simply his condition at the time she happens to be talking, the tense is strange. *sunt numerata* ‘could be counted’ is not sufficiently defended by the present in Tac. *Dial.* 21.8 (that style is beautiful in which) *non eminent uenae nec ossa numerantur*. There in any case *numerantur* could mean ‘are counted’, because so conspicuous, cf. Quint. *Inst.* 1 *pr.* 24.

Acanthis, though played on, is an actual name, cf. e.g. *CIL* VI 22781 (Acanthis; father Acanthus).

ossa in 64 demands a supplement. For *a me* (Barber) before the caesura cf. e.g. 2.17.18 *cum in me*, 29b.30 *per se*, 3.6.42 *per me*. The strange pl. *tenues* . . . *cutes* must be changed to the sing. (Jacob). Cf. on the line Housman (1972) III 1118–20.

65–6 The dedication to give thanks for death contrasts with the dedication at the end of 4.3 to give thanks for safety (under conditions). The killing matches A.’s death (both involve the neck); but the dove is set against her: doves are models of fidelity (2.15.27–8), and are *Veneris dominae uolucres, mea turba* (3.3.31). Venus is seen as the agent of A.’s death (cf. *ob meritum*), as Jupiter is of Tarpeia’s; *regina* stresses her power (cf. Hor. *C.* 3.26.11 to Venus, with N–R’s n.). But A.’s death appears quite natural, unlike young Tarpeia’s violent death; Venus’ agency and enmity are the narrator’s interpretation.

67–70 Whereas Tarpeia’s extraordinary death was described with remarkable brevity, the narrator dwells on this more ordinary death. He gloats: *uidi ego* (67) takes up A.’s phrase (61) and applies it to her own destruction. She had wanted to kill him (17–18); now he has seen her die. The details of death and body combine to make her revolting.

67 rugoso: she exemplifies the decline she was warning of (*rugis* 59).

crebrescere (Housman) ‘grows more frequent’; *concreescere* (Ω) ‘solidify’ is unsuitable (Heyworth (1999) 92).

68 The ominous *cruenta* and the aged *cauos* are repulsively juxtaposed. For bad teeth as a stock feature of age, see Watson on Hor. *Epod.* 8.3. A *dens cauus* is hollowed out by decay, *exesus* (Pliny *NH* 23.148, 30.22–5).

69–70 The death is coloured in with sordid specifics. The breath of life is also the foul breath from decayed teeth. At Plaut. *As.* 893–5 an old man unwisely contrasts his wife’s breath with that of a young woman. A.’s low origin is shown by the *inherited* rags, used for a bed (cf. *Juv.* 6.117 *tegetem praeferre cubili*); her poverty is shown by her ramshackle home (cf. *Petr.* 74.14 *hic qui in pergula natus est aedes non somniatur*).

animam . . . exspirare (sc. *Acanthida*): cf. e.g. *Ov. Met.* 5.106 (severed head on altar) *medios animam exspirauit in ignes*, 7.860–1 *in me . . . animam . . . exhalat*.

horruit ‘shivered’, and thereby ‘shuddered’.

pergula: a construction attached to another building; *curua* (Ω) ‘bent out of shape’ seems likelier than *curta* (ς) ‘broken’. Since the place has a hearth, and the fire goes out at her death, she presumably lives there, alone. It also symbolizes her body, bent (cf. 2.18b.20 *anus . . . curua*), with the warm life extinguished. Cf. e.g. Lucr. 3.773–5 on the body as an old house for the soul; Pushkin memorably compares a dead body to an ownerless house (*Evgenij Onegin* 6.32.9–14).

71 exsequiae: A.’s funeral is to be slight not because she so chooses, like the narrator in 2.13, but because she is poor and unloved. It will have no gifts from well-wishers (cf. Tib. 2.4.44 *nec* (sc. *erit*) *qui det maestas munus in exsequias*). The poet’s *pompa* in 2.13.25 consists only of his own books, to symbolize his achievement (cf. e.g. D.H. *Ant.* 8.59.3); A.’s is to consist of objects that exhibit her sordid old age and her now broken power. For *fuertint* (Graevius: *-ant* Ω), see intro. to poem.

A private offer of land for burial excludes as undesirable those who had been engaged in *quaestum spurcum*, *CIL* 1² 2123.1–14; cf. McGinn (2004) 141.

72 uincula: a hair-band (pl. for sing. cf. e.g. Sen. *Thy.* 544 of a diadem). For hair-bands in portraits, cf. e.g. the sculpture Naples 6285 (AD 26–50), R. Bonifacio, *Ritratti romani da Pompei* (Rome 1997) 49–51, pl. XI; or the painting Brit. Mus. EA 74709 (AD 50–70), S. Walker and M. Bierbrier, *Ancient faces* (London 1997) 41–2. *furtiua* ‘stolen’ shows deceit, *rari* age.

mitra: characteristic old women’s wear (Ov. *Met.* 14.654–6 (*picta*), *F.* 4.517–18); but she is so old and negligent that even this item is now faded and dirty.

73–4 Watchdogs are an obstacle for lovers in Tibullus (1.6.31–2, 2.4.31–2 *hinc . . . coepit custos liminis esse canis*). The narrator looks back resentfully to his difficulties with breaking in. *fallenda . . . pollice* suggests his own deceit and know-how. *pollice* means ‘fingers’ or ‘hand’: see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 2.4.27–8. His wish for a dog to terrify A. (3–4) acquires new point.

Reference to wakefulness and ‘bars’ invites comparison with 47–8, where a different situation is in view. There the girl-friend lives in her own house (cf. e.g. Tib. 2.6.47–8); here a girl-friend lives in the *lena*’s house. The reader is intrigued by the implied past of the narrator and, if she is the same, of the *amica* in 21–64. Even A.’s circumstances may seem to have changed: a *pergula* would be open, with no locked door.

in combines result and intention.

fallenda: *fallo* with the thing instead of the person involved, cf. 4.11.80 *oscula*, Ov. *Her.* 20.45 *retia*.

clatra ‘bars’ would be a colloquial alteration of *clatri* in the direction of its Greek original κληῖδρα, cf. Caper *GLK* vii 108.16–17 (2nd cent. AD?). The sense may not be very different from the more straightforward *claustra* (ς); cf. Col. 9.1.4 *serisque . . . clatrare*.

75–8 In 2.13.31–8 the narrator’s tomb had displayed a choice and refined minimalism: the ashes in a *paruula* jar; *in exiguo laurus super addita busto*; an inscription of two lines; fame like that of Achilles’ tomb. At 1.7.23–4 lovers will say at the narrator’s tomb *ardoris nostri magne poeta iaces*. A.’s tomb must show that she is poor

and friendless (*lenae* is emotional rather than informative). The amphora marking her burial is a sign of poverty in itself (cf. G. Calza, *La necropoli del Porto di Roma nell'Isola Sacra* (Rome 1940) fig. 10); it is aptly old and broken. The tree is a wild tree that grows among tombs (Hor. *Epod.* 5.17) and destroys them (Mart. 10.2.9 *marmora Messallae findit caprificus*). There is no inscribed stone (cf. Calza p. 44), but all lovers are to throw stones and voice words of hatred.

76 *urgeat, uis*, the apostrophe, the pressure from above (cf. 1.1.4 *et caput impositis pressit Amor pedibus*; 4.11.27 *umeros urgeat urna*): all give a sense of vigour, and stress the undoing of A.'s power.

77–8 The speaker generalizes his stance, though rich lovers might not share his animus. For throwing stones at a tomb or jeering at the occupant cf. Hom. *Il.* 4.176–81, Eur. *El.* 326–31 (both), Ov. *Tr.* 3.11.26. In view of *sit tumulus* 75, *hoc bustum* ('tomb', *OLD* s.v. *bustum* 2a) must refer back, like *hunc* (76).

scabris 'rough-edged'; it enhances the idiomatic *saxis caedere* 'pelt with stones' (Cic. *Ver.* 1.69, Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.128). Cf. Argent. *AP* 7.403.5–6 (*GP* 1481–2): passers-by are *not* to make others throw stones at the *leno's* tomb.

uerba mala: abusive words, cf. 2.9.22 *forsitan et de me uerba fuere mala*, Cat. 11.15–16 *pauca nuntiate meae puellae | non bona dicta*. A., who dismissed mere *uerba* at 54, will reap some now.

4.6: APOLLO

This poem concerns the temple of Palatine Apollo (dedicated 28 BC) and the battle of Actium (31 BC). For readers of P. the most significant question about the temple is whether this poem was the first to connect it with the battle (cf. H. Jucker, *MH* 39 (1982) 82–100; later, see Ov. *AA* 3.389–90 *uísíte laurígéro sacrata Palatía Phoebo | (ille Paraetonícas mersít in alta rates)*). We cannot in any case assert that it was the first: much poetry has been lost, probably including other treatments of Actium (cf. the epigram *SH* 982 and the hexameter *Carmen de Bello Actiaco* Incert. 46 Blänsdorf). And while the temple cannot be shown to have borne a divine title which referred to the battle (like *Apollo Actius*), it seems most unlikely that in 28 BC a link would not have been perceived. Octavian had recently won his decisive victory; Apollo was Octavian's special god, and the temple was physically connected to Octavian's house; Apollo, with a cult already at Actium, had been greatly honoured by Octavian there as the author of the victory (Suet. *Aug.* 18.2 etc., M. Horster, *Literarische Zeugnisse kaiserlicher Bautätigkeit* (Stuttgart 1997) 22–3). The decoration of the Palatine temple complex (and of the house) seems to allude to the defeat of Antony and Cleopatra: so especially on the 'Campana' plaques in the Museo Palatino (G. Carettoni, *Bolletino d'Arte* 58 (1973) 75–87) Apollo is depicted in probably symbolic contention with Hercules, the god of Antony (*LLMC* II 1.418–19 no. 410), and the female Gorgon is slain by Perseus.

The Palatine temple had originally been promised in 36, after (so Vell. 2.81.3) Octavian's victory over Sex. Pompeius; but temples could acquire further

meaning from events. So the temple of Mars Ultor was supposed to have been vowed in 42; but it was later applied to Parthia too (79–80n.). Ovid (*F.* 5.545–98) takes the plurality of events in his stride, like P. in 4.10. Sosius' restored temple of Apollo in *Circo* seems to have been connected later with the *princeps'* achievements: a frieze probably showed the triple triumph (E. La Rocca, *Amazonomachia* (Rome 1985) 94–5).

P. 4.6 reprises 2.31, which describes the Palatine temple; but it distinguishes itself in approach. Hence the emphatically visual 2.31 does not mention any battle, and the oblique 4.6 touches little on the temple, and does not state explicitly the nature of the link between temple and Actium which it presupposes. On the temple, and Apollo, see J. Gagé, *Apollon romain* (Paris 1955), esp. 479–581; A. F. Stewart, *Skopas of Paros* (Park Ridge 1977) 93–4, 127–8, 141–2, 151; Carettoni (1983); id. in *Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik* (Berlin 1988) 263–7; P. Zanker in K. de Fine Licht (ed.), *Città e architettura nella Roma imperiale* (Odense 1983) 21–40; *LTUR* 154–7, v 225; L. Balensiefen, *MDAI (R)* 102 (1995) 189–209; *MAR* 46–7; J. L. Butrica, *Phoenix* 57 (2003) 346.

4.6 is experienced by the reader as a poem in a book (F. Cairns in A. J. Woodman and D. A. West (edd.), *Poetry and politics in the age of Augustus* (Cambridge 1984) 129–68, envisages an original choric and festival performance, perhaps imagined). The poem does not present itself as written for an occasion, such as the event, if any, behind the coin of 16 BC with *APOLLINI ACTIO* (*RIC* 1² Aug. 365–6, cf. 170–1 (15–13 BC), 179–80, 190–3 (11–10 BC); Zanker (above) 38–9). The poets' party in 71–86 might perhaps evoke an annual poets' party say on 2 September (*feriae*: Actium) or 9 October (Apollo on Palatine), like that at the Liberalia in Ovid, *Tristia* 5.3; but it enters only at the end of the poem. 4.6 may even pointedly contrast itself with Horace's *Carmen Saeculare*, sung on the Palatine in 17 BC. That was indeed poetry for public performance, with no authorial narrator (contrast *Odes* 1.31, 4.6); P. 4.6 stresses the individual poet.

The poem flaunts its complication. It is an aetiological elegy on a particular temple of Apollo; it thus stands close to the *Aetia*, and the elegiac credentials of the poem are stressed in the opening. It also treats Caesar's most important battle, quintessential epic material, of exactly the sort for which P. had professed incapacity (2.1a, 3.3).

These complications of genre and subject are heightened by the relation of the poem to its predecessors on the battle. Earlier extant treatments of Actium are themselves generically striking; Virg. *Aen.* 8.671–728 exploits a form established in epic (ekphrasis) to incorporate matter outside the poem's epic world, in a mode outside normal narrative. But P. 4.6 is poetically a self-conscious latecomer; the final section stresses its date. In particular, 4.6 calls to be read as subsequent to Virgil's treatment, and to P.'s own in 3.11. The divergences are apparent: Virgil has no direct speech, P. 4.6 an important one; Virgil ostensibly concentrates on the fighting itself, which P. 4.6 omits. P. 3.11 dwells on Cleopatra as a woman;

she receives little space in 4.6, a very male poem, the more notably so after 4.3, 4. 5. Both Virgil and P. 3.11 dwell on the opposition of Egyptian and Roman; in 4.6 it hardly appears. The mentions of Actium and its sequel in what is now book 2 (1.30–4, 15.43–8, 16.37–42, 34.61–2) always include praise of Augustus; but they sometimes involve too, what is scarcely visible here, the tragedy of civil war (15.43–6, 16.38, 42).

Apollo himself adds to the literary complexity. His double nature, musician and violent archer, is dwelt on in many texts (e.g. Horace, *Odes* 4.6); Apollo Actius appears with a lyre on coins (*RIC* 1² as above) and the relief Budapest, Szépművészeti Muz. 4817 (J. Gy. Szilágyi and L. Castiglione, *Griechisch-römische Sammlung* (Budapest 1957) pl. XXVII; *LIMC* II 1.410 no. 335). This double role appears in P. 4.6, with elaborate generic implications. Apollo's poetic associations are complicated: he virtually begins the *Aetia*, the *Iliad*, the *Argonautica*, the *Carmen Saeculare* and this book (4.1.3). Callimachus devotes to him two (formally epic) hymns. He appears, as god of all poetry, in P. 3.3 and 4.1 (73–4, 133–4nn.); Cynthia takes her name from his epithet.

How does the strange narrative technique of the poem relate to the panegyric content? Some classical literature ostentatiously displays its unusual proportions and approach (one sense of 'mannerism'). Such abnormality simultaneously makes sense in its own terms: Pindar's telling of the Argonautic myth (*Pythian* 4) is to seem both wilful as narrative and apt as praise; P.'s treatment of Actium is to seem peculiar as narrative, apter as praise of Apollo and as aetiological elegy. Neither the strangeness nor the expressiveness should be ignored: Lucan's avoidance of epic battle-narrative in book 7 is strange as well as passionate, the strange absence of battle-narrative in P. 4.6 expresses the ease of Apollo's and Caesar's victory.

4.6 veers between imposing laudation and obsession with its own oddity and with genre. Relatively simple in praise are, unexpectedly, the speeches. Apollo's speech (37–54) should seem the core of a poem about Apollo, especially after the central speeches of 4.4 and 4.5. A speech from the god of oracles and prophecy might be expected to take us into prophetic and, in this poem, peculiar language and material (prophetic speeches by Apollo: e.g. Call. *Hymn* 4.88–98, Alex. Aet. fr. 3 Powell, [Tib.] 3.4.23–80). In fact, though the speech begins and ends with divine action, it is mostly closer to a general's exhortation. It largely avoids the divine and the rarefied, and draws us forcefully into political ideology. We do not find the conflict of outlook or personal antagonism between speaker and narrator that we find with the female speeches in 4, 5, 7, 8; narrator and god are in harmony.

The ensuing narrative, on the other hand, is handled capriciously; its extravagance passes at points into humorous paradox (59–60n.), maladroit argument (65–6n.), unpicturable action (66–7n.). The account is swiftly abandoned for a party. The poem seems now to be swerving away from an engaged or engaging treatment. But, remarkably, the panegyric is resumed in further inset speech, not by the poet-narrator but by other poets (extensions and displacements of the

narrator). The praise is now extremely up-to-date. Again the speech is entirely in harmony with the narrator's outlook; again its placing is prominent. The whole scene counterbalances the opening allegory, with its single poet and its stress on genre. But, equally, we cannot reduce the poem to these two speeches.

The tug between the metaliterary and the panegyric does not produce so strong and destructive a conflict as ironic undermining or the clash of opinions (cf. 4.4 and 4.5; 3.4, 3.5). We can hardly say that within 4.6 the panegyric is straightforwardly undone by the concern with poetry and the poem's own strangeness. Panegyric had long pursued self-display and unexpected strategies (cf., besides epideictic prose, e.g. Call. fr. 110 Pfeiffer (Lock of Berenice) or Theocr. 15 (Festival of Adonis)). The oscillations and interaction between the poem's absorption in tradition and itself and its praise of god and *princeps* issue in an irresolvably double work. 'Postmodern' play and resounding praise coexist. Which predominates is a question to which the poem elicits fluctuating responses as it proceeds; a view of the whole must include both and decline to simplify.

Some discussions: L. Hartmann, *De pugna Actiaca a poetis Augustae aetatis celebrata* (diss. Darmstadt 1913); Williams (1968) 51–7, 129–31; Pillinger (1969) 189–99; F. Sweet, *Arethusa* 5 (1972) 169–75; W. R. Johnson, *CSCA* 6 (1973) 151–80; J. P. Sullivan, *Propertius* (Cambridge 1976) 145–7; J. Warden, *CJ* 73 (1977/8) 19–21; R. J. Baker, *RhM* 126 (1983) 153–74; F. Cairns (above) 129–68; Stahl (1985) 250–5; B. Arkins, *Philologus* 133 (1989) 246–51; G. Mader, *Hermes* 118 (1990) 325–34; M. Wyke in A. Powell (ed.), *Roman poetry and propaganda in the age of Augustus* (London 1992) 98–140; S. J. Heyworth, *MD* 33 (1994) 59–67; R. A. Gurval, *Actium and Augustus* (Ann Arbor 1995) ch. 6; Janan (2001) 102–4; DeBrohun (2003) ch. 5; J. F. Miller, *MD* 52 (2004) 73–84; Miller (2004) 203–9; Coutelle (2005) 578–81, 595–8.

1–14 *sacra* and *sacris* ring line 1, and stress that the poem is a religious ritual; *sacra facit uates* improves on the declaration *sacra . . . canam* (4.1.69). This is a metaphorical rite, not, like that of Callimachus, *Hymn* 2, fictitious but literal. Formally, the point of 1–14 is to mark out the present poem, an offering of praise to Apollo and Augustus (cf. 2.10.23–4 *sic nos nunc . . . pauperibus sacris uilia tura damus* (to Augustus), Ov. *Tr.* 5.5.2 *pia sacra* (birthday-poem for wife)). The haughty third person in 1 and the command to silence, not participation (contrast 4.5.77–8), emphasize the difference from the last poem. But the subject is not announced until 11, and genre is important in 1–10. The reader is drawn to see the allegory as a vehicle for praising the poet's art, not just in this poem but in the whole book. The reader will recall the related presentation of a whole book in ritual language at 3.1.1–6, Hor. *C.* 3.1.1–4 (cf. further Virg. *G.* 2.476, Man. 1.20–2), and will recall Virgilian 'poems in the middle' (esp. *Ecl.* 6.1–12 (Callimachus), *G.* 3.1–48 (allegory)).

1 uates: on this portentous word for 'poet', which came into fashion in the triumviral period, cf. 4.1.75–6n., N–H on Hor. *C.* 1.1.35 and e.g. P. 2.10.19–20 *uates tua castra canendo | magnus ero* (with some touch of 'seer'). The religious aura

of the word helps the pomp; but not ‘priest’ here or in 10 (so Goold): prophecy and sacrifice are separate activities.

fauentia: a ritual call for silence; cf. Hor. *C.* 3.1.2–4 *faute linguis: carmina . . . canto*, Sen. *Vit. B.* 26.7, Pliny *NH* 28.11.

2 iuuenca: a common type of victim (e.g. Varro *LL* 6.54 public sacrifice to Hercules), but with a special potential for feminine beauty (cf. e.g. Virg. *G.* 3.219, Ov. *Met.* 10.272). At this stage the presence of a feminine element in elegy is suggested (cf. 5) more than its renunciation.

3–4 P. marks the genre of all his work by referring to the two foremost Greek elegists, Callimachus of Cyrene and Philetas of Cos. (For the little known of Philetas, now enlarged by Posid. 63 A–B, see the editions of L. Sbardella (Rome 2000) and K. Spanoudakis (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 229, 2002).) The pair appears, with similar point, at 2.34.31–2 (last poem of book), 3.1.1–6, 9.43–4 (on P’s whole work). This passage is also connected with 4.1.61–4 (ivy garlands, *Romani . . . Callimachi*). *certet Romana* suggests rivalry (cf. *certatis* 3.1.13 of contemporaries with P); 4 suggests likeness and equality. *aquas* evokes the pure spring of refinement praised by Callimachus (esp. *Hy.* 2.108–12).

corymbis: the ivy-berries stand for the whole garland, cf. Tib. 1.7.45, Stat. *Silv.* 1.5.16 *crinem redimite corymbis*. So *serta* (Scaliger: *cera* Ω) matches well, cf. Corn. Sev. fr. 3 Courtney *crinem circumdata sertae*; P. 2.30b.39 *capiti . . . pendere corymbos* (sign of poetic inspiration), 33b.37 *praependent . . . sertae*.

5 costum: an Indian spice (< Skt. *kūṣṭhaḥ*, via Greek). This is a modern sacrifice; *tura nec Euphrates nec miserat India costum* (Ov. *F.* 1.341) for sacrifices in early times. The metapoetic suggestions are strong: smooth, sensuous love-elegy is characteristically *mollis* (e.g. 1.7.19 *uersum*) and *blandus* (e.g. Ov. *Tr.* 2.465 *Properti*). A paradoxical generic transformation is suggested: cf. Ov. *Ex P.* 3.4.85–6 on the inadequacy of *molles elegi* for his triumph-poem.

date: for use in the rite, with *mihi* as dat. of interest; but *date . . . mihi* suggests secondarily offerings to P. (cf. *meos* 2, 3.9.46 *mihi sacra ferant*). The unspecified address sounds sacral; cf. Hor. *C.* 3.1.2 *faute*, Ov. *Ex P.* 1.1.47 *locum date sacra ferenti*. Incense-boxes were carried by attendants, as on the north frieze of the Ara Pacis (close-up picture: E. La Rocca, *Ara Pacis Augusteae* (Rome 1983) 37).

honores ‘offerings’: cf. *OLD* s.v. 2b.

6 An attendant holds a ball of wool (cf. Ov. *Met.* 6.19 for *orbis* thus) and goes round the altar decorating it with strands (*uitae*). Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 4.459 (shrine) *uelleribus niueis et festa fronde reuinctum*, Tac. *Hist.* 4.53.2 (site for temple) *euinctum uitis coronisque*; J. Pley, *De lanae in antiquorum ritibus usu capita duo* (diss. Gießen 1911). For the ritual threefold repetition cf. e.g. Ov. *F.* 2.651.

7–8 ‘Sprinkle me with water; let the pipe pour a libation of song from its Phrygian wine-jars at my new altar.’ The purification is standard, but pure water links with line 4. The sacrifice is accompanied as usual by the pipe (cf. e.g. Livy 9.30.5, Beard, North and Price (1998) II 149); for Mygdonian i.e. Phrygian pipes cf. Mosch. 2.97–8; M. L. West, *Ancient Greek music* (Oxford 1992) 91–2. P. is extending

ordinary expressions like *sacrifica dulces tibia effundat modos* (Sen. *Ag.* 584), with the double-pipe like jars of wine. This further metaphor strengthens the vehicle of the imagery, the sacrifice; simultaneously, *carmen* in this context looks to the tenor, the poetry. *recentibus* too suggests the new-made poem: cf. Cic. *Q. fr.* 2.9.1 *sua recentia poemata legit*, Ov. *Ex P.* 4.2.50 *huc aliquod curae mitte recentis opus*. Its literal point is just that the altar has been made specially. (A hasty or private creation from turf would ill suit the passage.)

9 *fraudes* and *noxae* primarily mean ‘harm’, as *aere* suggests (diseases etc. are to leave this country’s climate). Likewise the skies and sea are to favour Cynthia’s birthday at 3.10.5–6 *transeat hic sine nube dies* . . . (cf. Call. *Hy.* 2.19–20). The words secondarily suggest evil deeds; *ite procul* here recalls the ritual sending away of the profane or sinful (Call. *Hy.* 2.2, Ov. *F.* 2.623–4 *procul impius esto | frater*, Hor. *C.* 3.1.1–4 is again evoked). *pura* in 10 contrasts with *fraudes* and *noxae* in both senses.

10 At the end of the allegory *uati*, like *uates* in 1, explicitly returns to poetry. P. now alludes not to sacrifice but to the *daphnephoria*, the rite in which boys go from Tempe to Delphi, probably on a specific road, led by a boy carrying a branch of laurel (Theopomp. *FGH Hist* 115 F 80). The story was handled, aptly, in book 4 of the *Aetia*, perhaps the first poem of the book and with an invocation of the Muses (Call. *fr.* 86–9 Pfeiffer, cf. *fr.* 194.34–6, Luc. 6.407–9). P. approaches another temple of Apollo. He may allude too to the laurel trees around Augustus’ door on the Palatine (Ov. *F.* 4.953, with Fantham). Apollo and Augustus, as his subjects, supply laurel, also the poet’s prize; the new, untrodden path (Call. *fr.* 1.25–8 Massimilla) is made smooth after all (cf. *molle* in this sense at Ov. *Am.* 2.16.20). *mollet* suggests genre too; cf. Ov. *Ex P.* 4.16.32 *Callimachi* . . . *molle iter*. *nouum* implies a different treatment of the Palatine temple from those in 2.31 and Horace, *Odes* 1.31.

11–12 The naming of Calliope reverses 2.1.3–4, where Cynthia, not Calliope or Apollo, inspires P., and 3.3, where Calliope has favoured P.’s writing love-elegy. 11–12 point too to Virg. *Ecl.* 6.72–3: a Muse tells P.’s predecessor Gallus to sing the origin of Apollo’s Gryneian grove, to Apollo’s pride.

13 *Caesaris in nomen ducuntur* ‘are being made for Caesar’s glory’. Cf. 2.1.21 *Pergama, nomen Homeri*, Cic. *Pis.* 32 *ad meum nomen augendum*; P. 2.1.42 (P. cannot) *Caesaris in Phrygios condere nomen auos*. For *duco* cf. e.g. Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.43–4 *forte epos acer* . . . *ducit* (with play on warfare), 2.1.4 *uersus deduci*. Caesar’s name resoundingly encloses the line; cf. Virg. *G.* 3.47–8 | *Caesaris, et nomen* . . . *Caesar* | (but Virgil only promises for the future). There is here a suggestion via the *daphnephoria* of leading the songs to the theme of Caesar (cf. Heyworth’s rendering ‘are drawn to’).

14 *uaces* ‘go without being sung’; for the absolute cf. e.g. 1.13.2 *abrepto solus amore uacem*, Luc. 9.261 *quaerisque iugum ceruice uacanti*. Caesar, through Actium, exceeds Jupiter, as at 3.11.66 *uix timeat saluo Caesare Roma Iouem* (for mere equation with Jupiter through Actium cf. Man. 1.916 *in ponto quaesitus rector Olympi*, *SH* 982). *ipse* is used as at e.g. Plaut. *Cas.* 323–4 *negauit* . . . *ipsi me concessurum Ioui*. The sense

‘pay attention’ may be heard too (cf. 4.11.23), but would be feeble as the only meaning.

15 est ‘there is’. See 4.4.3–6n. for the introduction of the place, especially marked as epicizing by the initial *est*. *portus* and *Ioniae* join the beginning of this narrative to the end of 3.11 (*portus*, *Ionio*).

Phoebe: stressed at once; cf. 2.34.61 *Actia . . . custodis litora Phoebe*.

fugiens: for *refugiens*, ‘running backwards, receding’ to the shores at the back of the gulf. Cf. e.g. Pliny *NH* 4.76 (the Black Sea) *longe refugientes occupat terras*. *Athamana* means ‘of Epirus’, though *Athamania*, part of Epirus, does not itself include Actium.

16 murmura condit ‘stills the roar’; cf. 4.4.61 *murmura conde* (ending war; but this place will be the site of war).

17–18 present problems of structure and expression which resist cure; they could be spurious. *pelagus* (only here in P) must stand in odd apposition to *portus* (or *sinus*), and then *monumenta*, and *uia*, in awkward apposition to it. Emendation of *pelagus* does not satisfy: *Leucas* (Markland) should not be in apposition to *portus*; *pendens* (Fea) is awkward after *fugiens*; *celebrant* (Heyworth) contrary to convention prevents *huc* (19) from taking up *est . . . portus*. And how is harbour or sea *Actia Iuleae . . . monumenta carinae*? A reference to Octavian’s monument with enemy rostra at Nicopolis (cf. K. Zachos and Ch. Kappa, *Arch. Delt.* 52 (1997) 576–8) would not suit *portus* well; it would unsatisfactorily anticipate 67–8 and the narrative to come. The place is not an object that recalls (*monumentum*) Aeneas’ visit (Virg. *Aen.* 3.274–89) and so Ascanius’ ship. The *non operosa uia* could be an easy journey inside the gulf; but *uia* is curious for a destination (*portus*, *uotis*) and the relation to *uotis* is unclear. The journey to Actium is much worse for the appositions with *portus* and *monumenta*; the negative could hardly be justified by answered prayers. *nunc* (Carutti) *operosa* of the busy tourist route (so Heyworth) produces a strange connection with *uotis*; the perf. *onerata . . . est* (Heyworth) does not convince. The lines may have been composed out of 67–8, 3.11.71–2 etc., to provide the desired name Actium. Without them the remote-sounding place is effectively followed by *huc mundi coiere manus*; for the short interval between *est* and *huc* cf. e.g. Ov. *F.* 2.491–2, 679–82, 4.337–40.

19–24 sound like a historian’s preliminary account of the two sides (cf. Vell. 2.84); for *nec . . . aequa* (20) cf. Livy 33.18.14 *non numero tantum nec armorum genere sed animis quoque paribus et aequa spe pugnarunt*. But P. dwells only on religion and morality. Virg. *Aen.* 8.678–88 (*hinc . . . ; hinc . . .*) puts Augustus’ side first, but gives it seven lines, Antony’s side four; Propertius’ arrangement, especially with *altera . . . ; hinc*, seems also to throw the emphasis on to Augustus.

19 mundi: not only does the fate of the world depend on the battle (Vell. 2.85.1; cf. Livy 29.17.6); the forces of the whole world are fighting. The alliteration (*m*, *m*) furthers the pomp.

manus ‘armies’; cf. 2.27.8 *Mauors dubias miscet utrimque manus*, Plaut. *Amph.* 235, Hor. *Epod.* 10.12 *Graia uictorum manus*.

moles recalls Virgil's *tanta mole uiri turritis puppibus instant* (*Aen.* 8.693, cf. 5.118). A mass standing on the water sounds deliberately strange; it is less hyperbolic than Virgil's islands and mountains (*Aen.* 8.691–2).

21 damnata Quirino: consigned to Quirinus (for destruction), cf. Hor. *C.* 3.3.22–3 (Troy) *mihi [Junio] | castaeque damnatam Mineruae*. P. 2.16.38 *damnatis* of Antony's soldiers shows more sympathy (cf. 2.16.42). Quirinus is the deified Romulus; Augustus dedicated his temple, grandly rebuilt, in 16 (Dio 54.19.4, *LTUR* v 183–5, *MAR* 214). He originates from Troy (Sil. 13.266 *Iliaci . . . Quirini*) in the same sense as Augustus from Alba Longa (37). He stresses Rome's long tradition, threatened by Cleopatra; but the distance from Romulus' time is also felt (cf. 4.4, 4.10.5–22). The book thus enriches Virg. *G.* 3.27 *uictorisque arma Quirini* (on Actium).

22 femineae: by contrast with Virg. *Aen.* 8.685–8, Antony is omitted from the poem; Cleopatra usurps a male and Roman role (*pila* suggests Roman javelins). Cf. 4.9.50: Hercules' hands do girls' work. At Hor. *Epod.* 9.11–16 women and eunuchs merely direct Roman actions (cf. *turpe . . . conopium* with *turpiter* here). It was against Cleopatra that war was officially declared (cf. M. Reinhold, *Studies in classical history and society* (Oxford 2002) 54–8).

apta manu (dat.), 'fitted to, taken up by'; cf. Hor. *Epod.* 7.1–2 *dexteris | aptantur enses*. Not *acta* (5): they are not yet in use.

23–4 match 21–2: *ratis, signa, Augusta*, match *classis, pila, femineae*; patriotism and divine favour answer treachery and divine condemnation. The lines take up Virg. *Aen.* 8.679–80 *hinc Augustus agens Italos in proelia Caesar | cum patribus populoque, Penatibus et magnis dis*. As the echo in *hinc Augusta* (adj.) brings out, P's lines, unlike Virgil's, do not directly present any people or even gods.

plenis louis omine uelis arrestingly infuses the physical with divine aid. For Jupiter's involvement cf. 3.11.41 (fighting Anubis), Man. 1.918 *ipsa Isiaco certantur fulmina sistro*; for the god in the gen. with *omen* cf. Ov. *Met.* 10.278.

iam docta: cf. 39. Octavian is no novice.

25 P. gives more idea of the shaping of battle-lines than Virgil, but his language removes us from human agency: the agent is the sea (the sea-god Nereus in metonymy). The structure of 25–30 subordinates the movements of ships to Apollo. The language is *recherché*: the metonymy, derived from Hellenistic poetry (Call. *Hy.* 1.40, *al.*), was not yet common in Latin; the verb *luno* is rare (Ov. *Am.* 1.1.23; not the participle *lunatus*). *lunarat* and *radius* may serve as a foil to the appearance of the sun-god (cf. 85–6n.). Tactics are scarcely suggested here; on the tactics of Actium, now hard to recover, see J. M. Carter, *The Battle of Actium* (London 1970) ch. 16; C. B. R. Pelling, *CQ* 36 (1986) 177–81, on Plut. *Ant.* 65–6 and in *CAH* x² 54–60.

26 picta: light from the armour and weapons (cf. Stat. *Theb.* 5.557 *armorum radios*) brightens the blue water. *icta* (Dausqueius) is also attractive, though the striking would not cause the trembling as one might expect. For the pictorialism cf. Man. 4.515 (Phrixus' golden ram) *uitreum findens aurauit uellere pontum*. The

line also makes a contrast of period with 4.1.27 *nec rudis infestis miles radiabat in armis*.

27–8 Apollo at his birth on Delos made it a fixed, not a floating, island. The wandering and buffeted Roman state will likewise be made fast, by Apollo and Augustus. Cf. Dio 52.16.3: storm-tossed Rome has long been dashing hither and thither in the waves. Thus the Callimachean story (*Hymn* 4) acquires political resonance.

27 uindice in this sense, ‘rescuer’, already sounds political (Livy 6.18.8 *uindex uester*, 27.45.7 *urbis Romanae*, 35.45.7 *Graeciae*, Aug. *RG* 1.1 *rem p. . . in libertatem uindicauit*). It is used of Augustus and his native land at 41.

28 ‘For it was mobile before when it suffered the angry winds.’ Cf. Ov. *AA* 2.237 *saepe feres imbrem. non (ς) tulit* is alleged to mean ‘could not withstand’, by analogy with 4.9.62 *nec tulit iratam ianua clausa sitim*. But ‘could not endure (so broke)’ is much easier there than ‘could not endure (so was moved by them)’ here.

29 astitit ‘took up place’. Cf. 3.7.11 *uolucres astant* (in the air) *super ossa marinae*. The perf. denotes a decisive act, cf. *mox* 37 and contrast the permanent *stantem* 27. It is Augustus who stands in *puppi*, with supernatural light, at Virg. *Aen.* 8.680–1.

30 ‘Shone, curved three times into a twisting flash.’ The *flamma* is a kind of thunderbolt. The conceptions of the lightning as three-pronged (cf. *LIMC* viii 1.421–61 e.g. no. 74, Ov. *Met.* 2.325 *trifida . . . flamma*) and as cork-screwed (*LIMC* ibid. e.g. no. 248, Virg. *Aen.* 4.208 *fulmina torques*) are mingled (cf. *LIMC* ibid. e.g. nos. 62–8). Apollo’s status is unexpectedly enhanced by the supreme god’s thunderbolt (cf. 14); hence *noua*, which marks too the innovation on Virgil (29n.). It also suggests a wider novelty (cf. 10). Callimachus declines to thunder like Zeus (fr. 1.20 Massimilla); Apollo forbade P. *tonare* (4.1.134); sublime orators cast thunderbolts (Cic. *Orat.* 29, 234, Pliny *Ep.* 1.20.19). This elegiac poem claims a sublimity more suited to epic.

31 non ille attulerat crines in colla solutos: Apollo’s hair is bound for action. In Tib. 2.3.25 *crinesque solutos* shows his negligence; *solutos* here conveys an unwarlike ease. In early Imperial art strands of Apollo’s hair often reach his shoulders, but he wears a band (*LIMC* ii 1.363–464 nos. 33, 302g, 304 etc.) or wreath (painting in Museo Palatino from the House of Augustus, where he sits with the lyre, but wearing a quiver, Carettoni (1983) pl. XI). We know almost nothing of his hair on the statue in the Palatine temple (H. G. Martin in *Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik* (Berlin 1988) 262–3). *attulerat* is probably just preterite in sense (‘brought’): see 4.8.81–2n.

32 testudineae . . . lyrae contrasts with Apollo’s appearance at the battle his appearance in Scopas’ statue in the temple, where he had a lyre (cf. also the statue in the portico, 2.31.5–6, and intro. to this poem). The poem comes closer to the event than the pre-existing cult-statue. Apollo was also holding a lyre when he appeared to the narrator in 3.3.14. *inermis* suggests a paradoxical (or provocative) antithesis between poetry and this epic material.

testudineae lightly infringes the distinctness of epic in 31–6: it recalls the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes* (epic in ancient terms), where Hermes invents the tortoise-shell lyre and gives it to Apollo.

33–4 condense Hom. *Il.* 1.43–52, itself a swift passage. P. rightly takes *Il.* 1.47 νυκτὶ ἑοικώς ‘looking like night’ to refer to Apollo’s angry expression (cf. *Il.* 12.463). P. passes at once from a look to slaughter, and from anger with Agamemnon to destruction of the Greek army (cf. *Il.* 1.52 for the pyres). Apollo’s wrathful slaying of the army, not the leader who had offended him, was much criticized (Heraclit. *Hom. All.* 6.3–4).

quali reverses the *qualem* of Tib. 2.5.9, where Apollo is told to look as he did when hymning Jupiter after the Titanomachy (cf. 69–70 below).

Pelopeum ‘grandson of Pelops’; cf. 3.19.20, *Il. Lat.* 131 *Pelopeius heros*.

uultum (Rossberg): i.e. *talem quali*, governed by *attulerat*. It is difficult to understand ‘he came’ with *uultu*; the change is easy.

egessitque ‘emptied’, cf. Gk. (ἐκ)κενόω e.g. Aesch. *Supp.* 659–60 (a plague emptying a city of men); Lucr. 6.1140 *exhausit ciuibus urbem*; Stat. *Theb.* 1.37 *egestas . . . mortibus urbes*. ‘Carried out for burial’ suits *avidis* less well.

Dorica castra ‘Greek camp’; the same phrase 2.8.32, Virg. *Aen.* 2.27, *al.*

35–6 Apollo’s first exploit in archery was to kill the snake Python at Delphi. P. seems to draw especially on A.R. 2.701–13, and on Call. *Hy.* 4.91–3 (also epic in ancient terms), which describes how Python wrapped Parnassus in its coils (cf. Stat. *Theb.* 1.563–5, Claud. *Ruf. pr.* 1.5–6); but the treatment in *Aetia* 4 is lost (Call. fr. 86(?)–9 Pfeiffer). Other epic accounts: *H. Hom. Ap.* 355–74 (with ἦ (Wolf) 355), Call. *Hy.* 2.97–104.

soluit ‘slackened’ (in death), and also ‘loosened’. The vigorous act contrasts with *solutos* (31). For *per* (‘all through’) cf. Lucr. 6.797–8 (many things) *membra per artus | soluunt*.

†lyrae†: not yet invented, as 32 reminds us. From 32 the word has obviously come. The inviting *deae* would denote the Corycian Nymphs; they lived on Parnassus, and urge Apollo on at A.R. 2.711–12. *imbelles* and *timuere* are reasonable inferences from Apollonius, supported by Call. fr. 75.56–7 Pfeiffer (they flee a lion). Cf. A.R. 2.821–2 ‘the very Nymphs feared’ the boar. Nymphs are goddesses, though lowly (Theocr. 13.44, Virg. *Aen.* 12.785–6 etc.); but *deae* secondarily recalls the Muses, who are occasionally assigned to Parnassus (Mart. 4.14.1 *Castalidum*).

37–54 Instead of an exhortatory speech from the leader to his troops (cf. Octavian in *Bell. Act.* 46c Blänsdorf), we have a private exhortation from the god to the leader. The passage draws to some extent on Virg. *Aen.* 9.638–60, where Apollo, in disguise, *deters* Ascanius from fighting. But the god’s speech has much in common with human speeches of exhortation in historians. (On these see J. Albertus, *Die παρακλητικοί in der griechischen und römischen Literatur* (diss. Strasburg 1908); E. Keitzel, *CW* 80.3 (1987) 153–72; M. H. Hansen, *Historia* 42 (1993) 161–80, *C&M* 52 (2001) 161–80.) Not only Octavian’s exhortation in Dio (50.24–30), but a typical exhortation in Livy (21.40–1, Scipio), presents ideas like those here:

of previous success and experience (39–40, cf. Livy 21.40.3, Dio 50.24.4), fighting for Rome itself (41–4, cf. Livy 21.41.13–15, Dio 50.27.7), the justice of the cause and its effect on morale (51–2, cf. Livy 21.41.10, Dio 50.24.1). For the size of Antony's ships (47–8), cf. Dio 50.29.1–4; for alarming show (49–50), cf. Livy 10.39.11–12 (*uana magis specie quam efficaci ad euentum*); for ending on the time for battle (54–5), cf. Xen. *Anab.* 3.2.32.

37–8 draw mythical and contemporary time together. Augustus comes 'from' Alba Longa, founded by Ascanius (no verb, cf. e.g. Virg. *G.* 3.2 *pastor ab Amphryso*, Livy 5.32.6). Likewise, the Forum Augustum displayed Augustus' ancestors, including the Alban kings (Ov. *F.* 5.564; *II* XIII 3 nos. 2–5; P. Zanker, *Forum Augustum* (Tübingen 1969) 16–18; M. Hofter in *Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik* (Berlin 1988) 194–200). Ascanius and Alba are of striking importance in the probably pre-Augustan depiction of Rome's origins on the frieze from a columbarium of the Statilii on the Esquiline (Rome, Mus. Naz. Rom.). *Hectoreis* brings in Troy and, after 33–4, the *Iliad*'s war; *Auguste* (the climactic name) is juxtaposed with *Hectoreis* to contrast Augustus' victory (39) with Hector's failure (cf. e.g. 2.8.31–8). Hector, Creusa's brother, was part of Ascanius' family, cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 12.439–40 *te* (Ascanius) . . . *auunculus excitet Hector*.

mox 'next', resuming from *astitit* 29. Cf. e.g. 4.1.131.

39–40 uince mari: not merely *uince*; Octavian has already defeated Antony on land (cf. Dio 50.13.1–14.3). The words suggest the glorious combination of victories *terra marique* (Hor. *Epod.* 9.27; Aug. *RG* 3.1 [*b*] *ella terra et mari* . . . *s[aepe gessi]*; J. H. Oliver, *AJP* 90 (1969) 180 (inscription to Neptune and Mars at Nicopolis); P. R. Hardie, *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford 1986) 308–10). But they also suggest that the whole world will be ruled by Augustus; cf. e.g. Hor. *C.* 1.12.57 *reget aequus orbem* (Livy fr. 65 Jal: Augustus announces *totum orbem terrarum* . . . *Romano imperio* . . . *subditum*).

tibi in this position is emphatic; *tibi* and *meis* ring the clause.

An effective metonymy makes *arcus* and the arrows the subject of *militat* and *fauet* instead of Apollo. *umeris* points to Hom. *Il.* 1.46 (33–4n.); but the crucial weapons first appear here in the poem. *hoc* dramatically points to what Apollo is carrying, and *onus omne* hints at the quantity.

41–2 Octavian is to free Rome from fear as Apollo freed the Nymphs (36). Other links between them are formed by *solve* (*soluit* 35, in a different sense) and *uindice* (27–8n.).

patriam: Rome, not Italy, as 43–4 show. The couplet portrays Rome's decision as both official and heart-felt; similarly, on Italy, Aug. *RG* 25.2 *iurauit in mea uer[ba] tota Italia sponte sua et me be[ll]i quo uici ad Actium duces depoposcit*.

imposuit joins the charge laid on Augustus to a metaphorical cargo.

publica uota suggests the prayers of all individuals, and official ceremonies before a war: for these cf. Livy 31.9.5–10 (*uoto publico* 7). *publicus* is a striking word in poetry, first used by P. at 3.10.26 (figurative), by Horace at *C.* 2.1.10, and never by Catullus, Lucretius, Virgil or Tibullus.

43–4 Romulus and Remus took auguries to see who would rule Rome; Romulus, standing on the Palatine, saw twelve birds to Remus' six (Enn. *Ann.* 72–91 Skutsch (there Romulus on the Aventine), Livy 1.6.4–7.1, Ov. *F.* 4.807–36; 4.1.49–50n.). The story itself matches the contest of Octavian and Antony to lead Rome (cf. *avis* at 20). But the main point here is that Rome was founded with proper ceremonies; the results were auspicious, as Augustus will prove (*bene*, cf. e.g. Enn. *Ann.* 541 Skutsch *tonuit laeuom bene*). Cf. Enn. *Ann.* 155 *augusto augurio . . . condita Roma est* (quoted by Suet. *Aug.* 7.2 in considering the meaning of *augustus*), Livy 5.52.2 *urbem auspiciato inauguratoque conditam habemus*.

In the context of this poem, the Palatine draws Romulus, Apollo and Augustus together. Octavian as augur and consul in 43 allegedly repeated Romulus' count of twelve vultures (Suet. *Aug.* 95, App. *BC* 3.388). The unusual gen. *murorum* ('in relation to') underlines the parallel with the *augurium salutis* (seeing if *salus* could be sought) carried out after Actium (Dio 51.20.4), to show peace at Rome (*CIL* vi 36841 with n.; Dio 37.24).

45 ah (Kershaw): disapproving, cf. 1.15.27 *audax ah nimium*, Ov. *F.* 2.45 *ah nimium faciles*. The connective *et* (Ω) makes no sense; *en* (ς) should stress a vivid sight (and cf. A. Kershaw, *CQ* 42 (1992) 282–4); *heu* (Kershaw's preference) is less obviously appropriate. The second *ejac.*, *pro*, shows a Roman indignation; cf. Hor. *C.* 3.5.7 *pro curia inuersique mores!*, Sen. *Polyb.* 17.4 *pro pudor imperii!*

remis audent: cf. Virg. *Aen.* 9.320 *audendum dextra*; *TLL* s.v. *audeo* 1257.6–9.

45–6 pro turpe Latinis | principe te fluctus regia uela pati! 'oh, it is shameful for the Romans that the waves should endure a queen's sails when you are *princeps*' – shameful, that is, in these circumstances (cf. *remis audent* and 48), when a monarch is fighting a *princeps* to conquer Rome with Roman soldiers. The Romans detest kings: cf. e.g. Livy 27.19.4–5 *regium nomen alibi magnum, Romae intolerabile esse . . . Latinos* (Markland), which attractively defines *fluctus*, would have to mean the waters of the Roman province of Epirus. For *Latinus* as 'Roman' cf. Hor. *C.* 4.14.7 (*legis*), Ov. *F.* 3.177 (*dierum*), Sil. 6.641 (proper noun); for the dat. after *turpe* cf. 3.15.21 *tibi turpe tuam seruire puellam*.

47–8 nec te quod classis centenis remigat alis | terreant 'do not be frightened that their fleet rows with a hundred oars in each ship'. *remigat* takes up *remis audent* (45). *alis* is used, not of sails or parts of sails as usual, but of oars, following an epic use of 'wings' for oars in Greek (Hom. *Od.* 11.125, cf. West on Hes. *WD* 628). Antony's ships were bigger than Octavian's (cf. Vell. 2.84.1, Plut. *Ant.* 62.2, Dio 50.32.2); but P. with self-conscious artificiality converts this into epic terms. *centenis* comes from Virg. *Aen.* 10.207–8 *centenaeque arbore fluctum | uerberat* (cf. Hom. *Il.* 20.247, Sil. 11.490); 100 oars for a warship would actually be far from impressive in the first century BC.

inuito: cf. 1.17.14 *inuito gurgite* (the first ship).

49–50 The pentameter punctures the epic hexameter. The Centaur figure-heads too may come from *Aeneid* 10: a Centaur figurehead *saxum . . . undis immane minatur*, 195–7. (This confirms *Centauros* (Guyet: *-ica* Ω); *minantis* alone is too

vague.) That ship (named ‘the Centaur’) was Etruscan, on Aeneas’ side: here Centaurs are transferred to the foreign enemy. They become a symbol of barbarous disorder: cf. e.g. *Ov. Met.* 12.219 *saeuorum saeuissime Centaurorum*. The symbolism is deflated as bluntly as that of the enemy shield at Aesch. *Th.* 398 ‘emblems do not make wounds’.

49 ‘All the Centaurs threatening to hurl rocks whom the prows carry you will find to be mere hollow wood and painted terrors.’ The direct obj. for *experior* (cf. *OLD* s.v. 4c) would be harder to infer with *quodque* (Ω).

50 Though the whole speech implies victory, the future we might expect from the prophet Apollo appears only here. Even so, it is supported by a generalization (51–2) and not left to depend on prophetic authority alone.

51 ‘In the case of a soldier it is the cause he is fighting for that destroys or increases his strength’ (cf. *OLD* s.v. *et* 13).

52 suggests what is never said directly, that the enemy soldiers are Roman (cf. 22). Only Augustus is fighting for Rome (41–4). One may even hear in the background the common comparison of both sides’ merits in a civil war, e.g. *Ov. F.* 5.571–6 (*causa pro meliore*), *Luc.* 1.126–8 (*quis iustius induit arma*).

The abstract *causa* (51) and *pudor* (the shame of the soldier in the wrong) are vigorously made into the subjects, and placed at the ends of the lines. *excutit arma* is even livelier than *frangit*.

53–4 After a brief excursion into generality, the speech brings us to the moment of action. Two brisk clauses move Augustus into battle (*tempus . . . rates*); but the god then assumes the supreme position. *auctor* and *ducam* in context suit the god, yet also suggest a leader’s authority. *temporis auctor* means ‘I who have granted you this moment of opportunity’; cf. 4.4.81–2 n., *Cic. Ver.* 43 *moneo . . . tempus hoc uobis diuinitus datum esse*.

laurigera recalls us to 10 and the *daphnephoria* (‘laurel-carrying’); for cults of Apollo Daphnephoros, cf. e.g. *IG XII 9.191.A43* (4th cent. BC). The epithet clearly alludes to the *triumphator*’s laurel wreath, and the laurel bushes at Augustus’ door on the Palatine, given *ob ciuiis seruatos* (*RIC I*² Aug. 327 etc.; Aug. *RG* 34.1–2). The compound is grandiose. P. has no compounds in *-fer* or *-ger* in book 1; two in book 2; seven or eight in the aspiring book 3; four in book 4. Horace uses them twice, in *Odes* 3 and 4.

55 dixerat: see 4.4.67 n.

Apollo’s action takes up the beginning of his speech (39–40). It comes from *Virg. Aen.* 8.704–5 *Actius haec cernens arcum intendebat Apollo | desuper*. But there it is the decisive intervention in a battle already raging (cf. *haec cernens*); in P. Apollo launches the conflict. Virgil freezes the imperfective moment before the shooting (704–6); P. encompasses the shooting of all Apollo’s arrows (*pondus consumit* takes up *hoc onus omne* 40).

‘He uses all his arrows up on his bow’ seems odd and self-evident; not so e.g. *Virg. G.* 3.178 *tota in dulces consument ubera natos*, or *Sen. NQ* 3.11.3 *umor, qui desuit*

in *arbusta consumi*. *hostes* 'the enemy' (Heyworth, Hutchinson) could have been displaced through *arcus* and *hasta* in 56.

57 After the elaborate preparation of the speech, and the preceding descriptions, the battle is dispatched with 'mannerist' rapidity. The ease of victory is also conveyed; cf. Livy 6.7.6 (end of speech) *uos uincetis, illi fugient*. The language appears of grammar-book simplicity, but is actually pointed. Augustus has been told *uince* (39), but here *Rome* wins, a woman loses; cf. 21–2. For the indignity of a woman conquering Rome cf. 3.11.49 *si mulier patienda fuit*, *El. Maec.* 1.53–4 *ne posset femina Romam | dotalem . . . habere*. Apollo comes in the middle. His *fides*, since he has participated in the battle, will be constancy in action rather than truth in prophecy; he had long supported Octavian.

58 Instead of Cleopatra's *regia uela* imposing themselves on the waves (46), the ruined symbol of her royal power drifts on the sea. Cf. Lucr. 5.1136–7 *subuersa iacebat | pristina maiestas soliorum et sceptris superba*. The capture of Alexandria is ignored.

59–60 The appearance of Julius is elaborately woven in. He parallels Apollo, to whose speech his forms a brief echo. He contrasts with Cleopatra (57–8): his line retains its eminence. His joy from above matches the celebrations by the sea-gods below (61–2). *Caesar* picks up 54 and 56. And yet there is witty paradox in his utterance. He does not say ἐγὼ μοι υἱός 'you are my son' (Zeus speaking from heaven, Pind. *Nem.* 10.80), or ἐγὼ θεοί 'you exist, gods' (Laertes on his son's victory, Hom. *Od.* [24].351; cf. P. 3.15.21 *si deus es* to the inactive Jupiter). He rather affirms his own deity, as if it had been uncertain even to him until Augustus proved it. The position of *sum* and *est* marks assertion of something striking or controversial: cf. 3.6.20 *est poena et seruo rumpere teste fidem*, 4.7.1 *sunt aliquid manes*, Ov. *Her.* 14.4–7 *est mihi supplicii causa fuisse piam. . . | sum rea . . . | esse ream . . .*; Adams (1994) 69–76. Cf. Ov. *Met.* 15.746–51: Augustus above all makes Julius a star. Augustus is clearly a god; this suggests that his 'father' was. Cf. e.g. Livy 5.24.11 *deo Romulo, dei filio*, Virg. *Aen.* 9.642 (of Ascanius) *dis genite et geniture deos*. A necessary condition of Julius' divinity is his descent from Venus, cf. e.g. Virg. *Ecl.* 9.47 *Dionaei . . . Caesaris astrum* (Julius ORF 121 F 29 (68 BC): through Venus the family *cum diis immortalibus coniunctum est*). This is stressed by *Idalio* (i.e. given by Venus: she is *Idalia* from her cult-city Idalium in Cyprus). Julius is here notionally separated from the star (comet) into which he was transformed.

61–2 *prosequitur* denotes celebratory accompaniment of Augustus' triumphant return to the shore, as is shown by *circa . . . signa* in 62 (resuming 24). Cf. e.g. Livy 2.31.11 *decidentem domum cum fauore et laudibus prosecuti sunt*. Tritons accompany Augustus in a triumphal chariot on the cameo Vienna Matthias-Inv. 2230 (27 BC or later), S. Walker and P. Higgs, *Cleopatra of Egypt* (London 2001) 263. Wild male and soft female sea-gods are strongly differentiated in art (e.g. relief Munich 239 (1st cent. BC?), H. Kähler, *Seethiasos und Census* (Berlin 1966)); here the females play a subordinate role, cf. 36.

libera signa: contrast *sceptra* (58). Augustus has saved Rome's freedom.

63–4 Cleopatra does not flee in mid-battle (as at Vell. 2.85.3, Jos. *Ap.* 2.59, Plut. *Ant.* 63.8, 66.5–8 etc.; probably implied in P. 2.16.39–40). Her flight is a consequence of Augustus' victory. It contrasts with 61–2; *cumba* contrasts with her huge ships, 47–50.

hoc unum: her only aim is, not to escape death, but not to die on the prescribed day (after the triumph, as was normal). Cf. the parenthetic *hoc tantum* at Virg. *Aen.* 2.690 *aspice nos, hoc tantum*, Stat. *Theb.* 6.155, 11.192 (ensure my burial, no more). For the fut. part. of purpose cf. e.g. 4.7.48 *e nostro dotem habitura rogo*, Virg. *Aen.* 2.511 *fertur moriturus in hostes*, Ov. *Met.* 4.98. The emphasis is more on her failure, which leaves her few options, than on the manlike heroism which prefers suicide to humiliation (Hor. *C.* 1.37.21–3 . . . *nec muliebriter | expauit ensem*; womanly fear of death e.g. Plaut. *Rud.* 685–6). *male* 'scarcely' also shows her failure. (Rossberg conjectured *occultum* for *hoc unum*; but the Nile's source is hidden, not the Nile. *latebrosa* at Virg. *Aen.* 8.713 can mean 'with many hiding-places'.)

65 'Thank heaven she did not! What a small triumph one woman would have been!' Cf. *OLD* s.v. *melius* 7c, Ov. *Her.* 17.29–30, Val. Max. 6.1 *ext.* 3; for the impf. subj. instead of the plup., cf. e.g. 1.17.19–22, 2.16.4. For *quantus* 'how small!' cf. e.g. Plaut. *Rud.* 154–5 *homunculi, quanti estis!*, Man. 4.401. The narrator crushes Cleopatra's alleged 'I will not be triumphed over' (Livy fr. 62 Jal). She has *not* robbed the triumph of a highlight: so the monarch in front of the chariot was regarded (cf. e.g. Livy 30.45.3–4).

The narrator's vehemence gets his argument into trouble: Cleopatra was evidently not an impressive conquest. He undermines the rhetoric of Hor. *Epod.* 9.23–4, where Octavian excels even Marius, the general who defeated Jugurtha (also African). Marius' triumph (104 BC) was to be exalted in the Forum Augustum (*II* XIII 3 no. 17.2–4); P. uses an approved hero awkwardly.

67–8 After Augustus' victory and Cleopatra's failure comes Apollo's glory. The aetiology relates, not directly to the Palatine temple, but to the dedication of ten ships at Actium (Strabo 7.7.6; J. Gagé, *MEFR* 53 (1936) 41–5). The arrows take up 39–40, 55–6.

hinc points to, and stresses, the *quod* clause.

eius is emphatic. The form is rare in Augustan poets save later didactic (Manilius, Grattius): Tib. 1.6.25; Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.70, 6.76; Ovid not before *Met.* 8.16. It appears in probably and possibly interpolated lines (4.2.35 n.), and would support suspicion of 67–8 (del. Peerlkamp); but otherwise only their somewhat abrupt entrance seems against them.

una decem probably exploits debate on how many arrows Apollo used to kill the Python (Eust. *Il.* 52.11–15: 100, rather than 1, demeans the god; 1 in *H. Hom. Ap.* 357–8, 1,000 in Ov. *Met.* 1.441–4). But the narrator pushes the hyperbole beyond imaginable narrative, as the vague *uicit* indicates.

69 bella satis cecini: the profession is incongruous, after so undetailed a narrative. Contrast e.g. Cic. *Inv.* 1.109 (end of book) *sed quoniam satis . . . de omnibus*

orationis partibus diximus . . . The phrase particularly echoes 2.10.8 *bella canam quando scripta puella mea est*: it is as if the promised new stage in his work has not lasted long. But the appearance of elegist's distaste will itself be undone in 77–84. The narrator tactfully and aptly grounds the change in Apollo's will: Apollo instigates the poet's action as he did Augustus'. Though Apollo now reverses his exchange of song and peace for war (31–6), the cithara recalls his statues on the Palatine itself. Apollo makes his demand only now, and has not forbidden P. war-poetry, as in 3.3.13–26; he thus shows the poem's double nature as well as his own.

70 ad . . . chorus 'for dances', which he will accompany. For Apollo taking off his bow and quiver and playing the lyre cf. e.g. *H. Hom. Ap.* 3–12, 181–206 (for P. a single poem), *Sen. Ag.* 322–6.

71 'Now let party-goers in white enter the soft grove.' For *conuiuia* as *conuiuiae* cf. e.g. *Ov. Am.* 3.1.17 (*narrant*), *Stat. Silv.* 3.1.77 (*migrant*), *H-S* 747. White is worn at banquets (*Cic. Vat.* 30–2 etc.).

nunc takes up *iam* (69). The party seems like a celebration directly after the victory, as in *Hor. Epod.* 9.1–6, *C.* 1.37.1–4 (a Horatian presence is felt in the combination of partying, poetry and politics). But 77–84 will move us to the present.

molli, and *bland-*, recall 5 and evoke elegy; 2.34.42 (leave tragedy) *et ad molles membra resolute chorus* connects with 70 too. First appearances suggest that this time elegy will not handle war; but *Virg. Aen.* 8.125 *subeunt luco* is significantly echoed: in that *lucus* Hercules and Cacus are told of and Hercules hymned.

72 blanditaeque (ς) 'alluring' cf. *Ov. Met.* 10.555 *blanditur populus umbra*, *Pliny NH* 25.17 *rosae* . . . *blanditae* (Hutchinson: -am codd.) *sibi aspectu*; *H-S* 391 for deponent perf. participles as present in sense. Many petals from a garland fall sensuously on to the neck (cf. *Call. Ep.* 43.3–4). *blanditaeque* (Ω) 'enticements' is applied only to sentient beings; *blandae utrimque* (Lachmann) gives the garland an odd position. Party garlands imply the elegist's unmilitary life-style: 2.34.55–64, 3.5.19–22.

73–4 The hexameter presents an Italian luxury, the pentameter a foreign one. The wine prepares for 75–6; 74 closely matches 72: cf. *per mea colla*, and *Hor. C.* 2.11.13–17 *cur non . . . rosa . . . odorati capillos . . . Assyriaque nardo | potamus uncti? spica* (ear) suggests the perfume spikenard rather than saffron; cf. *Nic. Alex.* 402–4 (Cilician nard). Falernian was thought, not only by Italians, unsurpassed: cf. e.g. *Varro RR* 1.2.6 *quod uinum* (sc. *conferam*) *Falerno?*, *Athen.* 1.33a (Alban and Falernian most attractive wines).

perluat 'bathe'. J. D. Morgan's *perluat et* (*CQ* 36 (1986) 197–8) satisfactorily replaces the late *perlauo*, in un-Propertian tmesis (*perque lauet* Ω). The verbs *fluant*, *fundantur*, *perluat* combine to suggest opulent outpouring.

75–6 Often wine is said to inspire poets (*Hor. Epist.* 1.19.1–11, *al.*), and Bacchus is made a patron of poetry, with Apollo and the Muses (e.g. 3.2.9, [Tib.] 3.4.43–4). But the link with Apollo has special point in this poem.

Bacchus is being used to mark a shift in P.'s own work from private pleasure to Caesar. He has a similar role in Horace, *Odes* 3.25 (*Quo me, Bacche, rapis* . . .?). In

P. the shift is connected with 3.17, where the narrator asks Bacchus to free him from love and love-poetry, and with 4.1.62, where he is linked with P.'s patriotic poetry.

It is doubtful that there was a widespread debate on whether poets should drink water instead of wine as a source of inspiration; it is highly doubtful that P. would be seen to take an (ostensibly) anti-Callimachean position here. Cf. N. B. Crowther, *Mnemosyne* 32 (1979) 1–11; P. E. Knox, *HSCP* 89 (1985) 107–12; S. J. Heyworth, *MD* 33 (1994) 63–7.

fertilis plays on the literal sense, cf. Hor. *C.* 2.6.19 *fertili Baccho*.

77–8 The emphatically individual poet-narrator recedes; but whereas at Hor. *C.* 4.15.25–32 the single poet blends into public celebration, he here expands into a plurality of poets.

The poem now brings in successes of the last five years, in north, south and east. The submission of the Sugambri and other German tribes as Augustus approached rectified the defeat of M. Lollius (both events probably 16 BC: the text at Obseq. 71 omits a consular date, as often). See Vell. 2.97.1, Suet. *Aug.* 23.1, Dio 54.20.4–6. The submission is celebrated at Hor. *C.* 4.14.51–2, cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.14.45–50. There followed a sustained campaign in Germany. P. Petronius' expeditions in Ethiopia (24–21 BC) advanced impressively far south: Aug. *RG* 26.5 *in Aethiopiam usque ad oppidum Nabata peruenit[um] est, cui proxima est Meroe* (the capital). Accounts: Strabo 17.1.54, Dio 54.5.4–6.

Cepheam: Cepheus was a mythical ruler of Ethiopia, father of Andromeda.

79–80 In 20 BC Phraates IV of Parthia, in fear of a Roman invasion (Dio 54.8.1), returned Roman standards, especially those lost at the defeat of M. Crassus in 53 BC. This success was no embarrassment; Augustus gave it the strongest emphasis, as numerous issues of coinage indicate (*RIC* 1² Aug. 28, 41 etc.). See Intro. section 2. The success righted a disastrous defeat (Ov. *F.* 5.589–90, Vell. 2.119.1); it showed the Romans' supposed rivals in empire forced into supplication (Hor. *Epist.* 1.12.27–8, *RIC* 1² Aug. 287, Aug. *RG* 29.2). Although Augustus boasted of an effortless victory (so Dio 54.8.2), the standards were, or were to be, dedicated to Mars Ultor (*RIC* 1² Aug. e.g. 28 (c. 19–18 BC) reverse: Mars holds standard in temple (MARTIS VLTORIS); *LTUR* III 230–1; J. W. Rich, *PBSR* 53 (1998) 79–97). This neatly left open the possibility of later campaigns of 'vengeance'. The opportunities for these were increased by Augustus' recent adoption as sons of his grandsons C. and L. Caesar, born 20 and 17 (*CIL* VI 40361–4; Dio 54.18.1): hence the (in fact modest) campaign of 1 BC (Ov. *AA* 1.179 *Parthe, dabis poenas; Crassi, gaudete sepulti; F.* 6.468 *ultor erit?*). Ovid draws on these lines; but the fact of the later campaign (cf. Antip. Thess. 9.297 (*GP* 331–6)) implies that they accord with official policy.

79 *confiteor* and *fateor* are often used absolutely of one admitting to crime, with limited support from the context (*confiteor OLD* 1c). *confiteor* can probably

also be used absolutely of admitting defeat; 77–8, with *reddit* (ς) in 80, provide context enough to make the point clear. Cf. Skutsch on Enn. *Ann.* 513 *uictus fatetur*; Ov. *Am.* 1.2.19 *en ego confiteor!*; *Met.* 5.214–16 . . . *confessasque manus* . . . , Sen. *Ben.* 5.3.1 (games) *ubi inferiorem ostendit uicti confessione*. If change is needed, *constrictum* (Hardie) is preferable to *confectum* (Livineius): ‘vanquished by a treaty’ would be at best sarcastic. *noctem* . . . *sic ducam carmine* (85) would perhaps be helped, and the unappealing sequence *ille* . . . *hic* . . . *hic* removed, by reading *haec* (ΠΛ) *referam* (Hutchinson), ‘sero confessus . . . Parthus: (Slothouwer) | *reddit*. For the lead into speech cf. e.g. Ov. *Met.* 1.700 *talia uerba refert*.

80 Remi: for ‘Romulus’, cf. 4.1.9. Rome’s beginnings are evoked (cf. 37–8, 43–4) in presenting the most recent events.

81–2 ‘If he does show at least some mercy to the eastern archers (and not actually take their standards, or all of them), he will just postpone the remaining triumph to his sons.’ *aliquid* instead of *quid* after *si* here marks a limited retraction of what precedes. Cf. e.g. Cic. *Dom.* 134 *aut nihil dixit* . . . *aut, si dixit aliquid uerbis haesitantibus* . . . *differat* (Ω), a wish, would stress the delay rather than the continuation.

pharetris . . . Eois: exactly the sort of local colour that did not appear with Egypt earlier in the poem.

83–4 end 80–4, themselves like an inset epigram, with a variation of a motif from sepulchral epigram: if there is consciousness in Hades, the dead person rejoices at this tomb. So *CIL* III 6383.8–11 (1st cent. AD; 8 *si qu<i>d manes sapiunt*), VIII 212.38–45 (*ML* 199A; 2nd cent. AD), Kaibel 722.5–6 (Rome); the motif is already exploited in Catullus 96. Crassus has the limited ground for joy that his tomb is at least accessible to Romans, who can now enter Parthia (cf. e.g. Luc. 8.822, 851–8: Roman travellers and Pompey’s tomb). The opening of the previous poem contrasts. *nigras* . . . *harenas*, from an infernal river (cf. e.g. Sil. 13.571–3), adds a disagreeable picture of the underworld.

85–6 The party frames the patriotic utterances. Only the narrator is now mentioned as singing; this must stress that the whole party is P’s imaginative construction. The all-night length, and *mea uina*, renew the links with the narrator’s earlier life-style. But 76–84 make this ending contrast with 4.1.143 *illius arbitrio noctem lucemque uidebis* (cf. 4.3.29–32, 4.4.63–6: Arethusa’s and Tarpeia’s nights of longing, almost until dawn; 4.5.47–8, 73–4: the narrator’s nights) and 4.7.96: Cynthia’s ghost leaves at daybreak (89–92).

patera . . . carmine: for the ablatives with *ducam* cf. e.g. 1.14.10 *facili totum ducit amore diem*.

iniciat radios . . . dies gives a faint reminder of Apollo as sun-god and archer. Cf. Hor. *C.* 3.21.24: we will drink *dum rediens fugat astra Phoebus*; Fowler on Lucr. 2.60 *tela diei*. On the Palatine temple *Solis erat supra fastigia currus* (2.31.11).

4.7: CYNTHIA I

Cynthia (C.), once the centre of P's poetry, now causes a multiple surprise: she enters the book clearly and by name, she speaks at length, but she is dead. The reader will want to see how this poem relates to P's earlier poetry, and how to book 4 and the whole genre.

The poem has links to elegiac poetry outside standard love-elegy. Of particular relevance for this book is that the poem can be seen as providing an *aition*. This is connected, as often in book 4, with writing. The poem gives the origin, probably not even of C.'s tomb, but of a graffito to be written on a pillar (81–6n.): not much of a monument. (The tombs in 4.4 and 4.5 do not exist at the time the poem is spoken.) The poem could also be seen as an expanded 'sepulchral' epigram, telling of a death (cf. e.g. Posid. 56–7 A–B); or as a contracted *epicedeion*, like Parthenius' lament on his wife's death (fr. 1–5 Lightfoot; three books), or Calvus' on his mistress's (fr. 15–16 Courtney, evidently substantial, possibly with speech by her). Those *epicedeia* evidently gave much emphasis to the narrator's lamentation and praise; not so this poem, which is mostly a character's polemical speech (4.11 comes closer to transposed praise and lament). The voicing fits the marginalization of the love-poet's utterance in book 4, and the astringency of book and poem.

The poem appears around the middle of the book. It partly recalls a 'proem in the middle', beginning the second half (prologue; 2–6; 7–11); but the Homeric and Virgilian (and Lucretian) books of the dead come near or at the *end* of their poems' first halves (cf. esp. 55–70, 87–92nn.). In 4.7 beginning and not beginning, ending and not ending, are much entangled. Appearances by the dead can have associations with closing or with opening (cf. *non omnia finit* 1). The initial appearance of ghosts can mark the rebirth of a type of literature, as when Hipponax' ghost opens Callimachus' *Iambi* (fr. 191.1–4, 32–5 Pfeiffer), or Homer's ghost appears to Ennius at the start of the *Annales* (2–11 Skutsch; the *Iliad* itself was caused by a dream-appearance from Helen, Isocr. *Hel.* 65). The beginning of book 3 appealed for inspiration to the *manes* (cf. 4.7.1) of Callimachus and Philetas; C. herself was the inspiration at the beginning of book 2 (1.1–16). A type of poetry might at first seem to be resurrected here – but the poem actually claims to end it. Part of the *closing* sequence of the *Iliad* is the appearance of Patroclus' ghost to Achilles in a dream (Hom. *Il.* 23.62–108), particularly important for this poem. Also significant is the last poem of Tibullus' last book, near the end of which the mistress is threatened with a dream-appearance of her sister, who died suddenly (2.6.29–43; cf. 4.5 intro.). It is thus apt that C.'s appearance seems to close a type of poetry in P. – but in fact the very next poem will renew it.

Even in its closural aspects, the poem does not merely draw P's love-poetry to a harmonious end: it challenges our picture of that poetry. There is the question of truth (within the poetic fiction). It is often assumed that C. is lying when she presents herself as the faithful party, the narrator as the faithless. But, first,

the poem connects with 4.5: that poem presents a more negative, this a more positive, picture of the mistress than that created in books 1–3. That picture had been drawn from the perspective of a lover, a breed susceptible to false hopes and false suspicions alike. We must be invited to explore the intriguing lines of thought offered by both poems. The emphasis on female viewpoints in book 4 encourages this.

If we had supposed in books 1–3 that the narrator was often too credulous about C., that was itself, we might now think, the result of the narrator's perspective and rages (even the door in 1.16 could be seen as a biased Victorian). C.'s own infrequent speeches (1.3.35–46, 2.15.8, 2.29b.31–8, 3.6.19–34) had depicted *her* innocence and love; the position of 1.3, accusing the narrator near the beginning of the series, had suggested from the first the possible reversibility of his viewpoint. This poem expands on those speeches. Now the speaker bears the authority of the dead, and depicts herself in detail as living in Elysium. To read that depiction as a fraud would hardly suit the genre of reports from the next life. Some of her allegations cannot easily be read as her invention; some the narrator strives to suggest are unfair. C.'s definition of *fides*, and keeping and breaking it, seems far from clear, the scope for discrepant views apparent. The best approach is to see C., like Cornelia, as a sort of orator (cf. 95), who makes a highly effective case for herself. We hear only her side, so we cannot know how far we should (within the fiction) believe her. But we should be impelled to ponder.

The changes from the earlier poetry are partly related to the use of space and time. The spatial map of this poem is elaborate: the topography of the underworld is sketched (55–62); the relation of Rome and Tibur is marked out (81–6; cf. 4, 29–30). This use of place relates to C.'s status. Her living in Elysium shows her faithfulness and reliability; her having moved to Tibur, instead of the Subura, shows her upward rise. Her possessing her own house and household shows the independence she eventually achieves. The poem gives the affair a much denser context than hitherto, through the two households that such an affair would actually involve. Domestic space has been important in 4.5; 4.6 has swept the world; 4.3 has presented both domestic space and empire. This poem combines a close and unelevated evocation of households with ranging between earth and Hades.

Time too now adds shape to the earlier books. There had in books 1–3 been chronological hints, a beginning and (supposed) end; but mostly the poems had seemed to happen in a world where time was suspended, and little changed decisively. We now glimpse, what 4.5 had suggested, C.'s career pattern: from slavery and prostitution to a comfortable household, through the acquisition of wealth (for which cf. 2.32.41–2; for a lesser rise, Livy 39.9.5–7). We see a related ascent in Chloris' alleged career, from prostitution to a lover's house, and perhaps even marriage, if a dowry can be amassed. P. too appears to have become affluent, as the stress on his gold suggests (40, 47); 4.1.139 might encourage us to connect his literary success. The affair now has a more defined economic context.

Though C.'s speech moves about in time, and the narrative emerges gradually and indirectly, the affair and its aftermath now have a history.

Death is a preoccupation of book 4, as of the *Iliad*: there the advent of an actual dead person helps complete a theme. 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6, have shown us female deaths, variously distanced from tragedy; here the alleged poisoning is far from grandiose. Nevertheless, it is a quite different end to the affair from the death of the narrator, so often envisaged in books 1–3. C. has the central and pathetic role. And we now have an event, not mere gloomy fantasy. Contrasting conceptions of the dead run through the poem: the powerlessness of the dying and dead person, dependent on the living for honour and affection; the power of the lover even in death; the separated, and all-female, world of Elysium; the return of ghosts to earth. These aspects are related to the treatment of death in 4.5 and 4.11 (4.11 intro.), but are distinctively handled here. They are made to suit C.'s rhetoric, and the depiction of a C. who is both different and, magnificently, the same as ever.

Some discussions: W. C. Helmbold, *Univ. Cal. Publ. Cl. Phil.* 13 (1949) 333–43; Hubbard (1974) 149–56; F. Muecke, *BICS* 21 (1974) 124–32; J. C. Yardley, *BICS* 24 (1977) 83–7; D. K. Lange in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin literature and Roman history* 1 (Brussels 1979) 335–42; J. W. Allison, *CP* 75 (1980) 332–8, *CW* 77 (1983/4) 356–8; A. Dalzell, *Hermathena* 129 (1980) 33–5; J. Warden, *Fallax opus* (*Phoenix* Suppl. 14, 1980) and *Phoenix* 50 (1996) 118–29; P. Grimal in H. Zehnacker and G. Hentz (edd.), *Hommages à Robert Schilling* (Paris 1983) 132–3; Th. D. Papangelis, *Propertius: a Hellenistic poet on love and death* (Cambridge 1987) ch. 2; M. Komp, *Absage an Cynthia* (Frankfurt 1988) 33–121; Janan (2001) ch. 6; Rambaux (2001) 295–9; Wyke (2002) 103–8, 113–14, 184–6; DeBrohun (2003) 152–4; B. Dufallo, *Helios* 30 (2003) 163–79.

1 *Sunt aliquid* 'exist' (*sunt* is emphatic, cf. 4.6.59–60n.); cf. e.g. *Ov. Met.* 6.542–3 *si numina diuum | sunt aliquid*. The poem begins from the end of Homer's episode: Achilles says in grief (*Il.* 23.103–4) 'so even in Hades there is a soul and ghost' (or, with an ancient variant, 'soul and ghost are something'). The phrase shows the narrator reacting to a dramatic event (like cries 'so there *are* gods', cf. Oakley on *Livy* 8.6.5). It also affects to solve a philosophical controversy, unsolved at 4.6.83 (cf. 2.34.53, 3.5.39–46). The question of truth immediately enters the poem.

2 *luridaque*: ghosts have the pallor of corpses (*Ov. Met.* 14.747 *lurida . . . membra*).

exstructos (ζ) 'heaped up' (*OLD* s.v. 1c). *euictos* (F^{ac}) is only a slip or guess. Conquering does not suit *effugit*; passing an obstacle (*OLD* s.v. *euinco* 2) does not suit the corpse's place on top of the pyre. *Ov. Tr.* 4.10.86 *gracilis structos effugit umbra rogos* supports *exstructos* (85 there echoes 1 here); it does not matter that P. would use this, like many compounds, only once. *extinctos* (Passerat, cf. Heyworth) oddly specifies escape after the pyre is put out.

3 incumbere fulcro ‘lean over the bed-head’, cf. Ov. *Met.* 11.657 (Ceyx, again with a distortion of living intimacy).

4 Tiburis extrema . . . uia (Carutti: *murmur ad extremas . . . uias* Ω): from the narrator’s and reader’s perspective in Rome, Tibur, near where C. is buried (85–6), is the end of the *uia Tiburtina*, defamiliarized as ‘Tibur’s road’. *Tibure ad extremam . . . uiam* (Housman) would also be possible; the loose ‘at’ would not clash much with 79–86. She is buried by the road, outside the city; principal roads were a standard, conspicuous place for tombs (cf. e.g. D. Dexheimer in J. Pearce et al. (edd.), *Burial, society and context in the Roman world* (Oxford 2000) 78). For *extrema* cf. e.g. Stat. *Silv.* 4.3.114 *fine uiae* (at Cumae). P. is turning round 3.16.21–30: P., going to C. at Tibur, contemplates his own death; he does not wish to be buried on the road. Without *Tiburis*, *extrem-* would need to be changed as unclear. *tubae* (Housman) implausibly imports a funeral entirely different from C.’s depiction (23–34).

5–6 The narrator’s preceding dreams – and the present one? – spring from his preoccupations (cf. Lucr. 4.760–7, 962–1010 etc.; Cic. *Div.* 2.136–40). 5 emphasizes, in polemical contrast to Cynthia’s account, his concern about her funeral, 6 his pain at her loss. The expression of 6 also indicates his state that night, one of celibacy.

5 ‘When I, in my sleep, was utterly involved in the burial of my beloved.’ Both *somnus* and *amor* stand in for people; cf. 2.29b.41 for *amor* thus. *penderet* displays love: Ariadne *pendebat* from Theseus sailing off (Cat. 64.69–70), Dido *pendet* from Aeneas’ statue (Sil. 8.93). ‘Sleep was uncertain after the burial’ would implausibly require the reader to detach *ab* from *penderet* (contrast 3.1.24 *maius ab exsequiis nomen in ora uenit*). 6 would then suggest that the narrator was awake; this contradicts 14 and 87.

6 frigida: a cold bed often marks the deprivation of love, cf. esp. Posid. 55.5–6 A–B (death of desired bride; E. Magnelli, *ŽPE* 140 (2002) 15–16). *regna* suggests, bitterly, that the narrator is now sole ruler of this space (cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.10.17–20, with *uacuo*); it also conveys his former exultation in love (cf. 1.14.13: excelling kings). The syntax and outlook of Tattius’ *regni . . . cubile* (4.4.90) are inverted.

7–12 Hom. *Il.* 23.66–7 (cf. 107) stress the complete likeness of Patroclus’ ghost to his living self, in size, eyes (cf. 8 here), voice (cf. 11), clothes (cf. 8). P. initially stresses likeness (*capillos* makes against a reference to the effects of poison). But 7–12 together portray an eerie borderline, so that the state of C.’s body just before (7–8), during (8–9) and after (10–12) cremation combine in her appearance, and decay becomes more evident than continuity – except in her angry utterance (11). We soon lose the appearance of just reviving the love-poetry to which these features had notionally been central. Cf. e.g. 1.1.1, 3.10.15 (C. captured the narrator by her eyes and dress); 2.1.5–10, 12.23–4 (subjects of P.’s poetry praise of C.’s dress, eyes, fingers, hair); 1.15.5–8, 2.16.55, 3.6.11–12 (C.’s normal concern with hair, dress, jewels).

7 eosdem: for synizesis in *idem* cf. 2.8.26, 3.6.36, N–W II 396.

secum is unexpected when hair and eyes are part of C. It seems unelevated, perhaps colloquial. Cf. Sen. *NQ* 2.13.1 *fauillae . . . quae ponderis aliquid secum habent*.

8 adusta: burnt to her side, much like *inuro*; cf. 3.11.40 *adusta* (not *inusta*) *nota*.

9 solitum . . . beryllon: the jewel, probably worn by a woman in Posid. 6.3 A–B, presents a precise detail absent from earlier P.’s poetry about C.; the phrase thus indicates the incompleteness of that poetry.

9–10 ignis | . . . liquor |: the opposites show the different stages in the alteration. A limited alteration, as *adederat* and *summa* suggest; but all the more spooky. *summaque . . . triuerat ora* ‘had worn away the edge of her mouth’, cf. *OLD* s.v. *tero* 4a; *ora* pl. as e.g. 3.7.56. Yet she speaks as before; cf. 3.13.22 (Indian wives on the pyre) *imponuntque suis ora perusta uiris*.

11 spirantesque: as if living; cf. e.g. 4.11.74 *haec cura et cineri spirat inusta meo*.

11–12 et illi | pollicibus fragiles increpuere manus: a snap of C.’s skeletal fingers commands the narrator’s attention, as if waking him. (For *pollicibus* cf. 4.4.74–5n.; *manus* is pl. for sing., cf. e.g. 4.3.24.) The gesture here seems imperious (see H. Tränkle, *Hermes* 96 (1968) 571–4, Vel. Long *GLK* VII 47.17 (masters, teachers)). *at illi* (Ω) suggests another person, and an action starting after the speech; better *et* (Livineius), with *hysteron proteron* (see Norden’s edn. of Virgil, *Aeneid* 6, pp. 379–80).

13 perfide recalls P.’s love-poetry. The narrator addressed C. as *perfida* (2.5.3, 9.28, 18b.19); but the claims were mutual (1.6.18, 2.20.3–4). It seems just like their usual way. Yet *perfide* also occurs in the opening sentences of momentous speeches by the deserted Ariadne (Cat. 64.132–3) and Dido (Virg. *Aen.* 4.305, 366). Catullus’ Ariadne had been a point of both likeness and contrast in 1.3; C.’s speech contrasts with the dead Dido’s silence (Virg. *Aen.* 6.469–71). At all events, the claim of C.’s *fides* and the narrator’s lack of it structures the whole speech (13, 21–2, 51–4, 70). Cf. e.g. the *fides* of husband and wife asserted by both after her death on *CIL* 1² 1221 (the relief shows their marital pledge).

14 Patroclus’ ghost unjustly regards Achilles’ sleeping as proof he has forgotten him and his burial (Hom. *Il.* 23.69–71, with Richardson on 69–92; so too son to mother in Pacuv. 197–201 Ribbeck). As 15–20 imply, the rebuke has amorous associations as well: cf. 2.15.7–8, where C. wakes the narrator for more sex, and the popular Meleag. *AP* 5.152 (*HE* 4174–81, now on two papyri), where the sleeping mistress is called to her sleepless lover.

15–20 The implied situation diverges from books 1–3. In 15–18 C. needed stealth to escape from the house where she was kept. A husband would be one explanation; but *Suburae* 15 and the link with 4.5.73–4 point rather to a brothel. (On brothels see McGinn (2004), esp. chs. 2, 6–8, App. 1.) In books 1–3, as in 4.5.47–8, C. has her own house and controls entry (e.g. 1.16, 2.17.14, 20.23–8, 29b, 3.6.15–16). A natural inference is that C. is recalling the beginnings of their relationship, before her situation changed. Even so, 4.5 and 4.7 together hint that C. had once been a slave and a prostitute – a new light on her – and C.

nostalgically recalls not the world of P.'s earlier poetry but undignified activities more at home in comedy or mime.

15 exciderunt (ς) 'have been forgotten' (*OLD* s.v. gb). The perf. with *ē* (originally a distinct form) gives more forceful sense with *iamne* . . . *iam* than *exciderant* (Ω). The corruption is easy (Housman (1972) II 631, III 1068–9).

uigilacis furta Suburae: *furta* can denote just secret assignations; but *dolis* (16) and 17–18 show further trickery. Poets treat the Subura as the prostitutes' district (e.g. Pers. 5.32–3, Mart. 6.66.1–2; *LTUR* IV 379–83, McGinn (2004) 20–1). *uigilacis*, an unelevated form for *uigil*, conveys lively night-life (*clamosa* . . . *Subura* Mart. 12.18.2), and watchful eyes to evade. It contrasts with *somnus* (14).

16 fenestra includes both the space (*per* 17) and the sill (*trita*). *mea* could be used just because a *cella* was assigned to C.; Africanus' brothel, Pompeii VII 12.18–20, has an upper floor (L. Eschebach and J. Müller-Troilius, *Gebäudeverzeichnis und Stadtplan der antiken Stadt Pompeji* (Cologne 1993) 330; *PPM* VII 520–39; McGinn (2004) 232–9, 280).

17 quotiens takes up *trita*, and is taken up by *saepe*. So many repetitions stress their attachment, but for the reader convert one-off daring into humorous routine.

pependi graphically conveys C.'s intrepidity, as *ueniens in tua colla* conveys her devotion. She shows the physical daring, and mobility, that might be expected of the male lover. Cf. Ov. *AA* 2.243–8 (entry through the window shows risk taken for her).

19–20 Neither yet owned a house (cf. 4.1.132). The confluences of streets were gathering-places (*OLD* s.vv. *triuuium* a; *compitum* 1b), often thought vulgar or sordid (*OLD* s.vv. *triuuium* b, *triuialis*). There one could get away with indecent behaviour: cf. 2.17.15 (sex) *in triuiis*, Cat. 58.4 *in quadriuiis*. C. means to evoke a passion that scorned discomfort and gossip (cf. e.g. 2.20.22 gossip of *compita*); the reader sees squalor, as Catullus 58 indicates. 20 makes a contrast with beds, more often linked with bodies and warmth; cf. 6 and e.g. Petr. 132.15 (on sex) *quis uetat in tepido membra calere toro*? Unlike bedclothes (*OLD* s.v. *pallium* 2) these cloths touched the road.

mixto: a drastic extension of the use for people or bodies joined in sex (*OLD* s.v. 4c; 93–4n.).

21–2 foederis heu †taciti†: an oath, the context implies, to love C. for ever (cf. Hor. *Epod.* 15.1–11). P. presents it as standard for love to have an oath as its contractual basis (1.11.16, 2.9.31–6, 3.20.21–4); his usual oath-breakers, oddly enough, are women. C. turns the elegiac *topos* round into the anger of epic heroines like Medea (A.R. 4.358–9) and especially Ariadne (cf. Cat. 64.142 for the winds). *taciti* 'secret' is unlikely, with *uerba* to follow, and pointless: no lovers' oaths would be public. It would be too complicated to think of concealment from the narrator's parents. But if *taciti* is corrupt, it is rash still to credit a gen. of exclamation, outside comedy (H–S 85; Luc. 2.45 *miserae sortis* can be predicative). Say *pactum*?

The narrator ignores his own words (similarly e.g. Cat. 30.9–10); but the winds' refusal to listen suggests the equally unhearing gods. Cf. e.g. Tib. 1.4.21–2 *ueneris periuria uenti | irrita . . . ferunt* (common in contexts of love); Ov. *F.* 5.683–4 *falsoue citauit | non audituri numina uana Iouis*.

23–34 present a sequence, from death to burial, which consists predominantly of negations: a vehement rhetorical form (cf. e.g. Cic. *Pis.* 53–5, on Piso's inglorious return).

C. has apparently died in Rome (29–30), not Tibur, where her home is (cf. 3.16). If she was in her own house, why were her devoted slaves (73–6) absent from her death-bed and lying-in-state? The poverty of the funeral does not accord with a second house of C.'s, in Rome. 35–46 suggest that she died at the narrator's house; he organized a funeral, but with little feeling or expense. 29–30 could suggest that he was in a position of authority with regard to the funeral. (He did not accompany it beyond the city (29–30); he looks to have attended some of it (5, 7, 27–8).) The absence of *his* slaves in 23–4 poses no problem, despite 43–6; C. could no doubt connect it with Chloris.

The pathos, from C.'s perspective, is sharpened for the reader by the contrast with 2.24.49–52: the narrator had said he would be there to carry out her funeral rites, unlike rich lovers. He has now given C. the kind of funeral he wished on Acanthis (4.5.71–6; cf. *curt.* 5.75, 7.26). He had envisaged C. showing her love at *his* funeral (1.17.19–24, 2.13.29–30, 3.16.23–4).

23–4 gain force from 2.27.13–16: the narrator had said himself that a lover already dead can return to life *si modo clamantis reuocauerit aura puellae*. The pathos is only intensified by the difference between that extreme passage and C.'s self-consciously small wish (*unum* is forcefully placed); so *tempora parua* at Ov. *Tr.* 3.3.41–2.

at does not introduce a new theme or person, or an effective contrast of people or, especially after *cuius* . . . *Noti*, of statement. Perhaps *nam*? Another exclamation (*ei* Page) seems overdone, as it would not be rhetorically coordinated with 21–2.

mihi non oculos quisquam inclamauit euntes 'no one called to my eyes as they lost vision'. *inclamauit* has the shade of calling someone urgently to summon them (Cic. *Att.* 2.20.5, Ov. *F.* 3.756 *inclamatque suos*) or revive them (Cael. *ORF* 162 F 17 *nomen inclamabant*). If *euntes* is sound in this novel sense, the reference is probably not directly to the customary repeated calling of the name after death (Luc. 2.22–3, [Quint.] *Decl. Mai.* 8.10, Serv. *Aen.* 6.218). At 2.9.25–7 (and in 2.28), the narrator and others had shown more concern at C.'s apparently imminent death.

25 implies a guard was often set next to the corpse before burial (cf. *me propter*). So perhaps Firm. *Math.* 3.9.3 *custodes mortuorum cadauerum*; cf. Luc. 6.734. Such a guard would not seem practically necessary during the lying-in-state or the procession; but the split-reed rattle may suggest a ritual rather than a practical function (cf. R. C. T. Parker, *Athenian religion: a history* (Oxford 1996) 282–3).

26 A relief on the Tomb of the Haterii shows the dead person's head supported by a pillow (early 2nd cent. AD?; Vatican, Mus. Greg. Prof.; this relief inv. 9999; F. Sinn and K. S. Freyberger, *Museo Gregoriano Profano ex Lateranense. Katalog der Skulpturen* I.2 (Mainz 1996) 45–50, pls. 8–9). Here a broken tile suffices (cf. F. Muecke, *CQ* 28 (1978) 242; J. C. Yardley, *CQ* 29 (1979) 485–6). So at Mart. 9.2.11–12 the ill-treated friend gets a poor man's bier; the mistress's litter is contrasted. The damage to C.'s body continues (cf. 10). *obiectum* is 'put against' or 'on' the tile, cf. *OLD* s.v. *obicio* 2a; *iniecum* might be clearer.

27–8 His love should have been publicly visible. In Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.216–20 the husband's mourning captures the eyes of Rome. Achilles' grief-stricken slow movement and groaning at Patroclus' funeral (Hom. *Il.* 23.225) contrast with the narrator here.

curuum 'bowed'; Hor. *AP* 110 (*Natura nos*) *ad humum maerore graui deducit*.

atram: for black at funerals see Woodman and Martin on Tac. *Ann.* 3.2.2.

incaluise: cf. the cloth warmed by passion at 20; his feelings have chilled.

29–30 From Rome to Tibur is c. 27 km. The reader is to contrast 3.16, where the narrator will hurry on foot to Tibur at C.'s bidding. *piget* often indicates idleness, e.g. Livy 5.4.12, 44.22.14 *si quem id facere piget*, <et> *otium . . . laboribus praeoptat*.

at illuc | iussisses lectum lentius ire meum 'you should have bidden my bier go more slowly to the gates'. Negation, here implied, is typical of *si*-clauses before *at*. Cf. e.g. 4.4.57 *si minus, at*, Cic. *Ver.* 2.98 *si non pietatis, at salutis tuae ratio*, Ov. *Ex P.* 1.7.70. For the plup. subj. cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* 3.8.49 *terra contenta fuisses*, Luc. 7.646 *et bella dedisses*; H–S 336.

31 alludes to Achilles' calling on the Winds, with generous offers, to make Patroclus' pyre burn (Hom. *Il.* 23.192–216).

32 draws on two aspects of Roman practice. (i) dear ones would anoint the body on the pyre, in a loving act. Cf. 2.13.29–30 (C., as the next passages show, with kiss); Ov. *F.* 4.851–4 (brother and parents, with kiss), *Ex P.* 1.9.47–54 (friends); Val. Max. 4.6.3 (husband) *inter officium unguendi et osculandi*. (ii) the person who paid for the funeral would display his affection through expenditure on fragrant unguents and spices for the pyre: so often in Statius' *Silvae* (e.g. 5.1.210–14).

33 graue 'burdensome', cf. e.g. Mart. 9.55.6 *multis mittere dona graue est*.

34 piare here 'honour' a sacred object, cf. 3.10.19 *ubi ture piaueris aras*, Sil. 4.819–20. *busta*, then, means 'tomb', not 'ashes'. 33–4 do not refer to pouring wine on the ashes and putting perfume in the urn. Rather, wine was offered to the dead as part of the sacrifices after burial (so Petr. 65.10–11 with Porph. on Hor. *Epod.* 17.48; Don. on Ter. *Ad.* 587); flowers will have been too (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 6.883–6), as they were in yearly repetitions of such sacrifice (Virg. *Aen.* 5.77–9 (wine, and *iacit flores* on the tomb), *CIL* VI 1951.7–8 (wine and flowers); Bömer on Ov. *F.* 2.538–9). Minimal expense would have been needed: a wine-jar old and spoiled, and flowers that could readily be picked (cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 11.68–9; contrast D. Dexheimer, *Oberitalische Grabaltäre* (Oxford 1998) no. 189 (*II* x.v

no. 985; 1st cent. AD or later); future offerings of roses paid for). So *nulla mercede* 'paying nothing' (cf. *OLD* s.v. *merces* 4a).

35–46 The unfolding of the narrative is deliberately confusing. At first we think Lygdamus is C.'s slave, as in 3.6; but the account of the narrator's household in 41–8 suggests that the poisoning took place in his house, and that Lygdamus has always been his slave (cf. *uernae*). 4.8 confirms his ownership of Lygdamus: the fiction is flexible. Poisoning, implied conspiracy and torture make easiest sense on these suppositions.

C.'s claims on the poisoning are commonly dismissed; but the matter is less clear. If dying people claim (i) to have been poisoned (ii) to know who was responsible, both claims can be taken seriously, or questioned: cf. e.g. Cic. *Clu.* 30–1; Eck, Caballos and Fernández on *SC Pis.* 26–9. (i) C. thought it was poison on drinking it (36); there seem few grounds for the reader to think this mere fancy. (ii) *sensi* (I realized it was Lygdamus) rests on inference from the enmity between her and Lygdamus, seen again in 4.8. The inference might or might not be true, but is not made to rest on a ghost's authority (cf. Cic. *Div.* 1.57, Virg. *Aen.* 1.356, where ghosts reveal). More impressive is the assurance that torture will confirm Nomas' mixing of the poison (a specific accusation). Chloris' involvement is not stated, though other drugs are mentioned at 72; C. makes it possible to imagine a conspiracy. This too might or might not be true, within the fiction: C. could be inspired purely by jealousy. Allegations of sexual and financial reasons for poisoning are too frequent to have been thought intrinsically unlikely; cf. Woodman and Martin on Tac. *Ann.* 3.22.1; *CIL* VI 20905b.1–2; Sen. *Rh. Con.* 2.1.29 (in the world of mime cf. P. Oxy. 413.157–72). Here C. seems, as a dead person, to have knowledge of events in the house, whereas in 3.6 her beliefs about the mistress may have been all mistaken. She comes across at least as an orator with a well-presented case rather than a hysterical female; and the reader is left uncertain how to evaluate a case where (i) seems likely and we know little of (ii).

A slave's name in 3.6 was unexpected (it came seven times). The much greater detail here on names and household, and the interest in this class, are uncharacteristic of P. and Tibullus. Punishments and names of slaves are reminiscent of mime and comedy rather than elegy. (Cf. P. Spranger, *Historische Untersuchungen zu den Sklavenfiguren des Plautus und Terenz* (AMAW 1960.8) 47–50, 84–6 for punishments in Roman Comedy.) The names in this section are all actually found in the Empire: *Lygdamus* *CIL* VI 5327.2, 21744, XV 1418–19 (2nd cent. AD), cf. *AE* 1994 no. 367b (in Greek only *Lygdamis*); *Nomas* *CIL* VI 7099 etc., *AE* 1993 no. 751.12 (1st cent. AD), 1997 no. 957b (Spain, 1st–2nd cents. AD); *Petale* *CIL* VI 5238 etc., *AE* 1998 no. 912 (Gaul, Julio-Claudian?); *Lalage* *CIL* VI 4865 etc. (very rare in Greek papyri and inscriptions).

35 lamina 'sheet of metal', heated for torture, *OLD* s.v. 1d.

uernae marks C.'s sternness to the narrator: slaves born in the household were a favoured class, as inscriptions confirm.

36 pallida: the wine was made pale by poison (cf. [Quint.] *Decl. Min.* 321.24 *ne colore uenenum deprenderet*). Not transferred from the person: wine would need to have the general property of making people pale (cf. Kibel on Pers. 5.55).

37–8 ‘Even if cunning Nomias destroys her secret beverages, the hot tile will declare her hands condemned.’ With Numidian craftiness (cf. e.g. *B. Afr.* 73.2), she has created the poison. Cf. 2.32.27–8: C., not condemned for poisoning, has *puras . . . manus*. The torture will settle Nomias’ guilt even before trial (public or metaphorical); the *testa* is thought of like the juror’s tablet (4.11.49), on which is written *condemno* (*RS* 1.55).

ut (5): *aut* leads to syntactical chaos; C.’s suggesting alternatives is hardly apt.

saliuas: possibly poisonous spittle or slime, though a genitive is expected; there is certainly a play on *saliuae* as (the flavours of) types of wine (4.8.38; Pliny *NH* 14.61).

39–48 Chloris has taken up residence, it seems: she is ordering the slaves’ workload (41–2; cf. e.g. Juv. 6.474–95 for wives punishing slaves). Cf. 3.6.21–2, where the narrator has C.’s replacement *domi*. C., though familiar to the narrator’s slaves, has her own house (Chloris, if C. is right, did not). Attack on low origins is standard rhetoric (cf. 2.16.29–30); it here becomes more notable in the light of C.’s own shady past. The reader can view these sharp distinctions with detached amusement.

The reader must take it that Chloris exists, within the poem. A rival is indeed often imagined by lovers (cf. 1.3.35–6?); but the name and details of her conduct within the house make little sense as pure jealous fantasy (contrast 3.6, where the rival has no name, and could be the narrator’s own invention). The narrator is certainly not in bed with Chloris tonight, and the picture in 6 strives to counter C.’s in advance. But since it is common for substitutes in love to lose their attraction (Men. *Epir.* 430–41, Tib. 1.5.39–46, P. 4.8.47–8), the exact truth of the matter is kept unclear.

39 modo ‘just before’; here with perf. not impf., as e.g. at Ov. *Met.* 5.455–6 *quae modo brachia gessit, | crura gerit*. The couplet-form enhances the contrast.

inspecta est as of human goods, cf. *TLL* s.v. *inspicio* 1952.54–74; Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.83–93.

40 Chloris wishes to be seen in her finery now; cf. Livy 34.4.14 *cur non insignis auro . . . conspicio?* Now less of her body is visible (cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.94–5). She is not parading indoors: *humum* would surprise of the floor of a house; the cloak would not make a mark there, as it would sweeping through dust; and it is an outdoor garment. *cyclade* (also Juv. 6.259) will denote like ἑγκυκλῶν a cloak with decorated edge. For the action cf. Stat. *Ach.* 1.262–3 *decet aurata Bacchum uestigia palla | uerrere*.

41–2 Cf. 3.15.15 (jealous Dirce) *famulam pensis oneravit iniquis*.

at (Markland): 41 continues less easily with *et* once 40 is located outside.

rependit ‘weighs out in retaliation’; but this is inelegant, with *iniquis* confusing the point, and *rependit* and *pensa* deriving from the same verb. Elegant, by contrast, is Ov. *Her.* 9.78 *aequaque formosae pensa rependis erae* (a possible source of NA’s

reading). *rependit* gives two consecutive metrical rarities, | -ora re|pendit in feet 2–3, and | -pendit in|iquis| in feet 3–4 (Platnauer (1951) 5–6, 8–9). It may not go back even to the archetype: Π probably had *fundit*. *imponit* (Hutchinson) would include an idea of weight.

quasillis ‘baskets’, a prosaic word, used in poetry only at [Tib.] (Sulp.) 3.16.3–4 *pressumque quasillo* | *scortum* (itself a ‘low’ word). The undignified life of slaves is being evoked. Poetry prefers *calathus*, common in prose too.

43 The old slave has made the effort to go to Tibur, and has laid garlands on the tomb (cf. e.g. Tib. 2.4.48 (former lover), 6.31–2). She thus contrasts with the narrator (29–30, 33–4). Her name underlines her action (cf. πέταλον ‘leaf’). *nostra* must indicate affection, not ownership.

44 She is chained to a block of wood: a punishment (Plaut. *Poen.* 1153) and also a means of preventing trips to Tibur. *anus* increases pity for the degradation (cf. *immundi*) and harshness.

sentit ‘has to endure’; cf. *OLD* s.v. 4.

45–6 Lalage’s hair is twisted to form an unbreaking rope, by which she is hung up for whipping (*OLD* s.v. *suspendo* 1b). This is much crueller than the punishments in 41–4: Lalage has made a plea to the narrator in C.’s name, and so implied C.’s continuing importance to *him*. See *TLL* s.v. *per* 1155.60–75 (plea by a person dear to the addressee).

Lalage (‘chatterer’) suggests unrestrained speech, cf. *garrula* 42; it also brings a contrast with the relaxed and pleasant life of the Lalage (or Lalagae) in Horace, *Odes* 1.22, 2.5.

est ausa ‘had the temerity to’, from Chloris’ viewpoint.

47–8 form a climax. The melting of the portrait is the most direct attack on Cynthia’s memory. A portrait bust in the house makes a statement, here one of devotion; the gold heightens that statement. (See G. Lahusen in H. von Steuben (ed.), *Antike Porträts* (Paderborn 1999) 106; cf. e.g. the *bronze* bust of a female family member prominently placed in the Casa del Citarista, Pompeii I 4.5 and 25 (E. J. Dwyer, *Pompeian domestic sculpture* (Rome 1982) 87–8)). Portraits are destroyed to mark execration (cf. e.g. Cic. *Ver.* 2.158–60; *SC Pis.* 75–6; Tac. *Ann.* 11.35.1; Juv. 10.61–4 (melting)). But the pentameter scathingly adds a sordid motive. The dowry is presumably not demanded by the narrator (who in 39–48 is both subjected and rich); Chloris means to establish herself elsewhere.

te effectively picks up the implications of 46, and leads into 49. The subject is easily inferred, cf. e.g. 2.24b.23, 3.11.51; but a lacuna before 47 would be possible.

rogo primarily refers to the fire burning C.’s image; the image is equated with herself (similar play in Juv. 10.61–4, and implicit in the act). By extension *rogo* is linked to the pyre of 32: Chloris rises through C.’s death. It is a sort of pun on things, not words.

49–50 Her case complete, C. becomes magnanimous; so Artemis at Eur. *Hipp.* 1325–37 finds extenuation for Theseus after vigorously demonstrating his folly.

Even so, *non . . . insector* 'I am not attacking you like an enemy' (cf. Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.69 *non equidem insector*) is followed by the abrasive *quamuis mereare*.

longa, as he could not manage 'for ever', was something. Notably, she does not claim the literary eternity promised by P. (2.34.93–4, 3.2.17–26): cf. 77–8.

regna: commonly of lovers, cf. 6, 3.10.18 *inque meum semper stent tua regna caput* (a pointed echo); Murgatroyd and Maltby on Tib. 1.9.80. Here it denotes domination of the books through domination in love, with a possible hint to the reader that the latter was all a literary fiction. In 3.10.15–18 themselves, recollection of 1.1 obtrudes literariness and the book; there as here *Properti* recalls the author.

51–4 Whereas the narrator has been *perfidus*, C. has not. The enjambement gives immense force to *me seruasse fidem* (contrast the deliberately unimpressive 1.4.27 *praecipue nostro*); *me* is emphatic. It is not explicitly stated that C.'s *fides* too is loyalty to a *foedus* (the same as in 21?); but the context strongly suggests it. In 2.20, an important intertext, C. doubts the narrator's *fides*; he swears by his dead parents that he, like her (18), will be faithful to death: otherwise, may he suffer in hell (29–32)! Connections are sharpened by *iuro* (cf. 2.20.15), *si fallo* (cf. 2.20.16), the Fates (who are underworld gods, cf. e.g. Stat. *Theb.* 8.191–2), and 55–70. 13–48 have called into question the narrator's truth to his oath in 2.20; that invites us the more strongly to question his whole picture in books 1–3. C.'s own oath here might be just one more perjury (cf. Livy 30.42.20–1 for the problem); but oaths like these from one already dead are impressive (cf. 4.11.27–8 (Cornelia)). Uncertainty is a more suitable response to the surprise of this claim than dismissal.

51 'I swear by [*OLD* s.v. *iuro* 1b] the Fates' prophecy, which none can wind back.' For oaths by the Fates, cf. e.g. Theocr. 2.160. *reuolubile* is transferred from their spinning; cf. Stat. *Theb.* 7.774–5 *scis nulla reuoluere Parcas | stamina*. (–ē *stamen* (ς) is doubtful prosody so late in the line; *nemen* (Postgate) is doubtful vocabulary, cf. Courtney on *ML* 174.11). This *carmen* is more imposing than P.'s (50); his poetry on C. is to be destroyed (77–8).

52 tergeminusque 'triple (headed)'; cf. Ov. *Tr.* 4.7.16 etc. See 4.5.3–4n. The two halves of the pentameter contrast.

53 uipera: not here, as is often thought, the dead soul (cf. E. Küster, *Die Schlange in der griechischen Kunst und Religion* (Gießen 1913) 62–85). It is the sign of a neglected grave, and a disagreeable companion; contrast *CIL* VI 9118.12 (above the grave) *cantet aedon*. It aptly punishes falsehood; cf. *OLD* s.v. *uipera* b.

55–70 C. now shows that she has kept faith (*nam*): she has been classed in the Underworld not with those who have sinned against their men but with innocent or admirable lovers. She also contrasts with Patroclus, shunned by other ghosts and unable to cross the river (Hom. *Il.* 23.72–3 (74 suspected by West)). C.'s exposition itself gives her authority, like Virgil's Sibyl or Anchises.

P. has previously imagined the assembled heroines of mythology, with himself or C. among them (1.19, 2.28). The conception derives from Hom. *Od.* 11.225–330. In 4.7, to fit the argument, women are divided into the rewarded good

(cf. *Culex* 260–9) and the punished bad (cf. P. 2.18.27–8: hell for hair-dyeing). In Tib. 1.3.57–82 the division is made by Venus and related to love (love is more incidental at Lucian *VH* 2.19, cf. Simon. fr. 22 West?). P. more clearly than Tibullus implies no middle ground between blessed and damned; Tibullus more clearly than P. suggests that love is, or should be, essential to dividing the dead in general. Neither is of course presenting a worked-out theory. For a division with no obvious middle ground cf. e.g. P. Bon. 4 (H. Lloyd-Jones, *Academic papers* (Oxford 1990) II 333–42); there female chastity is clearly one route to felicity (99–100).

55 ‘Two dwelling-places [*OLD* s.v. *geminus* 5a] have been allotted [to the two groups] along the foul river.’ The Styx and other rivers run right round and through the Underworld: cf. Virg. *G.* 4.478–80, *Aen.* 6.438–9; those passages also show the standard muddiness. Deponent participles, even with *sum*, can be used passively (K–S I 111). *geminas* (Passerat) is attractive, but *turba* . . . *omnis* sounds like a new subject.

56 diuersa . . . aqua: different sections of water.

remigat: perhaps the dead row themselves, as at 2.27.13 (cf. Ar. *Frogs* 197–270).

57–60: 57–8 as they stand neatly provide two rivers, taking up *diuersa* . . . *aqua*. This is unlikely to be accidental corruption. But the arrangement *gemina* . . . *diuersa* . . . *una* . . . *altera* . . . *pars altera* does not work. One might also expect to hear a bit more of the sinners’ fate. Two possibilities (Hutchinson): (i) 57–8 replace a longer original; (ii) 59 too is part of a fussy and inept reworking. In favour of (ii) is the curious *ecce* 59. Poet-narrators use *ecce* to enliven a catalogue (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 7.706, Man. 2.43 *ecce alius* . . .); but it is less suitable here. The likeness to 3.24.15 *ecce coronatae* . . . *carinae* is in the circumstances suspicious. *parta* is in any case corrupt; but a sudden perfect would be surprising (e.g. Palmer’s *rapta*, sc. *est*). If the participle simply follows *ecce* with the nom. (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 7.706–7 *ecce* . . . *agmen agens Clausus*), the absence of a main verb to introduce 60–2 is awkward. *phaselo* (‘ship’ at [Sen.] *HO* 695) could be borrowed from 3.21.20; but in any case 57–9 (or 57–8) will keep parts of the original they abbreviate. For such interpolations cf. e.g. Stat. *Theb.* 4.31; the wish to spell out 56 furnishes a supplementary motive.

Clytemnestra and Pasiphae, doubtless in the original text, were both adulteresses. Clytemnestra appears at 3.19.19–20 (with *stupro*). Pasiphae, who used a wooden cow to be mounted by a real bull, appears at 2.28.52 *nec proba Pasiphae* (in the Underworld with other beauties), 32.57–8 *uxorem* . . . *corrupt* . . . *forma bouis*, 3.19.11–12 . . . *induit abiegnae cornua falsa bouis*. (Cf. *LIMC* VII 1.196–7 (Roman art).) The text ignores possibilities of sympathy implicit in Eur. *Cret.* fr. 472e Kannicht, Virg. *Ecl.* 6.45–60.

57 Clytaemestrae stuprum: cf. e.g. 1.20.15–16 *error* . . . *Herculis* = *Hercules errans*. Both places may distort epic periphrases like ‘the might of Heracles’ (Hom. *Il.* 2.658 etc.); but cf. 69–70n.

58 mentitae ‘deceitfully devise’ does not quite match other uses.

59 coronato: sailors vowed to garland the ship reaching harbour, *Ov. Am.* 3.11.29.

60 mulcet ‘gently touches’, *OLD* s.v. 1b. For roses in the Elysian fields cf. Pind. *Threni* fr. 58a.3 Cannatà Fera, Tib. 1.3.61–2. Epitaphs often imagine the dead person there, e.g. *CIL* III 6414.8–9.

61–2 Common features of Elysium are song and dance (e.g. Tib. 1.3.59), especially cultic (e.g. Ar. *Frogs* 316–459), and particularly Bacchic (e.g. *CIL* III 686 (= *ML* 184).17–18; cf. e.g. the scene of Dionysiac dancing, with cymbals, on a sarcophagus, Rome, Mus. Naz. Rom. 1303 (2nd cent. AD), Fr. Matz, *Die dionysischen Sarkophage* (Berlin 1968–75) II 180–2). *Lydia* suits Bacchus and his cult, cf. Eur. *Ba.* 13, 55–7 etc., P. 3.17.30, Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.61–2. Bacchus’ cult, as often, borrows features of Cybele’s; cf. 3.17.35–6 (Cybele’s cymbals in Bacchus’ rites); Diogen. *TrGF* 45 F 1.1–4 (from the *Semele*; Cybele’s women with bonnets and bronze cymbals).

fides ‘lyre’; the word interacts with the thematic *fides* ‘faithfulness’. Pleasant sound accompanies the virtuous women, unpleasant sound a breach of *fides* (53–4). *numerosa* is ‘playing in rhythm’; cf. Virg. *Aen.* 6.646: Orpheus in Elysium *obloquitur numeris*.

63–70 Two examples of blameless women, matching and in *Hypermetra*’s case echoing the pair seen in 57–8. Innocence is enough to gain the Elysian Fields (cf. *CIL* VI 21846.3–4 *insontem . . . ducite | per . . . campos . . . Elysios*). Andromeda, chained up to be devoured by a sea-monster because of her mother’s impiety, is a type of unjust punishment; cf. 3.22.29 *Andromedae resonant pro matre catenae*, Enn. *Trag.* 119 Jocelyn (*innocens*), *Ov. Met.* 4.670–1 (*immeritam*), Man. 5.540–1 (*culpa parentum*). *Hypermetra*, who refused to kill her bridegroom like her forty-nine sisters, is here portrayed as moral and gentle (cf. Hor. *C.* 3.11.25 *scelus*, 39, 43 *mollior*; *Ov. Her.* 14.6 *si scelus ausa forem*, 43–68), but not as heroic in defying her father (so Horace). The language of 67–8 suggests his unjust disapproval. The faultless pair, unfairly punished or maligned, convey an idea of C. as an innocent person, unjustly treated. But C. is injured, not by mother or father, but by her man himself. The narratological intricacy of placing their accounts inside C.’s is given a twist by her *not* telling her real story to them – a final proof of her loyalty.

63 Andromedeque et Hypermetre: unusual metre marks out the pair of Greek names: no break after the second foot when there is no caesura in the third (Platnauer (1951) 7).

maritae ‘wives’; for the dependent *sine fraude* cf. *Ov. Met.* 15.120 *animal sine fraude*. They eschewed Clytemnestra and Pasiphae’s tricks and the breach of *foedera* (cf. *Ov. Met.* 2.558 *commissa duae sine fraude tuentur*). For Andromeda as wife cf. 2.28.22 *Persei nobilis uxor erat. marita* (Heinsius) for *Hypermetra* alone would be unbalanced, a contrast between Andromeda and *Hypermetra* rhetorically ruinous.

64 narrant historias . . . suas ‘tell their own myths’. Cf. 1.15.24 *nobilis historia*, 4.1.119, in Greek e.g. Acusil. fr. 30 Fowler. *sancta* (Housman), unlike *nota* (Ω), goes convincingly with *pectora* in apposition to the two women; cf. e.g. Sen. *Helv.* 19.1 *sororem tuam, illud fidelissimum tibi pectus*, *TLL* s.v. *pectus* 916.66–917.12, *OLD* s.v. 5 (worthy, affectionate people). *foedera nota* (Heinsius), acc., muddles the argumentation of 63–8; *nota* would have curiously little point in the sandwiched apposition (cf. J. B. Solodow, *HSCP* 90 (1986) 129–53). The dead swap their stories: 2.28.25–8 (C. to Semele); Hom. *Od.* [24].1–204, Plato *Ap.* 41b1–5.

65–6 The emphasis is on *sua maternis* and *nec meritis*.

liuere: for pres. = perf. inf. cf. e.g. Cat. 64.126–8. The word connotes the humiliation of punishment (Ov. *Am.* 2.2.47 (slave) *compedibus liuentia crura gerentem*), and the spoiling of beauty (*Cir.* 450 (Scylla probably speaking) *marmorea . . . liuescunt brachia*). Andromeda’s tearful laments (69) evoke, but also contrast with, her desperate laments at the time. These opened Euripides’ *Andromeda* (fr. 114–22 Kannicht cf. fr. 1–10 Bubel).

67–8 The sisters are the Danaids, famed occupants of Hell; Tib. 1.3.79–80 puts them there for crimes against Venus. *sorores* is set against *Hyperestire* at the end of the caesura and *suum* at the end of the next line. *magnum* gives her family’s viewpoint (with irony); *ualuisset* takes it up, *scelus hoc* negates it. *magnum* also suggests μέγας ‘big’ > ‘appalling’, used e.g. at A.R. 1.662 of the Lemnian women killing all their menfolk.

69–70 The hexameter provides an elevated close, undercut by the pentameter, with its final stab at the narrator’s faithlessness. (*perfidiae crimina* (‘misdeeds’) *multa tuae* = *crimina tua multa, perfide*; cf. e.g. 1.13.18, 1.17.19 *meum . . . dolorem* = *me dolentem*.)

sanamus amara (Markland) gives the right kind of sense, though *amara* could do with more supporting language, as with a verb like *purgamus* (cf. Hor. *C.* 4.12.19–20 *amaraque | curarum eluere*). With *amores*, *sic* would wrongly imply that Andromeda’s lament was about the pains of love. *mortis lacrimis* means ‘tears shed by us in death’.

71–86 C. now gives instructions, as she would have done on her death-bed, had she not been alone. Such *mandata* were part of the proper death, with loved ones around: see Ov. *Tr.* 3.3.43 *nec mandata dabo*, Tac. *Ann.* 2.71.3 etc. C.’s detailed instructions on slaves and tomb in fact resemble a will: the return to prosaic reality is underlined. For examples of wills, commoner in Greek than in Latin, cf. Diog. Laert. 5.11–16, 69–74 etc., P. Petrie III 1–19 (3rd cent. BC), P. Oxy. 489–95 (2nd cent. AD), *ILS* 8377 (Sicily, AD 175), 8379 (time of Trajan). Notably, P.’s poetry is not included with the tomb as a means of ensuring C.’s memory: those everlasting *formae* . . . *monumenta* (cf. 3.2.17–26) are to be destroyed, and replaced by a two-line notice. Contrast Ov. *Tr.* 3.3.71–80 (Ovid’s poems more lasting than a short inscription on his tomb).

71 sed turns back to business and to command; *at* is more commonly so used.

si forte ironically acidifies polite phrasing (cf. Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.95 *si forte uacas*).

72 Chloridos: the other woman's name appears at last. It is actually found (*CIL* vi 27687, *al.*), but has many associations here. It wittily connects with the mythological Chloris married for her beauty, who is shown by Homer in the Underworld we have just left (*Od.* 11.281–7). It links with the Chloris (or Chlorides) in Hor. *C.* 2.5.18 and 3.15.8 (in 3.15.8 the name, 'green and flourishing', has surely become ironic). It contrasts with Acanthis (4.5.61–4). *C.* nastily joins the name with *herba*. Accusing a mistress of witchcraft is entirely standard: cf. e.g. Livy 39.11.2 *illius excetrae delenimentis et uenenis imbutus nec parentis . . . uerecundiam habere*.

73 nutrix: for *C.* to have kept her nurse suggests life sustained at a respectable level; the earlier suspicion of a period in a brothel conflicts. Better still, the nurse is called 'Virginity' (personified Sapph. fr. 114 Voigt; *Parthenia* is rare as a name (*IG Bulg.* 1² 186 *ter* (pl. 98)); *Parthenis* e.g. *AE* 1995 no. 901 (Spain, 2nd cent. AD)). The nurse, as her lack of greed shows, did not behave like a *lena*.

tremulis: cf. Cat. 61.161–3 for old people shaking; P. 2.18b.5 *canis . . . annis* for the transference.

74 potuit nec tibi auara fuit 'she could have acted rapaciously towards you, but she did not'. For the ellipse of *auara esse* see *OLD* s.v. *possum* 2b. Service is mentioned not, as in a will, to justify the bequest (Diog. Laert. 5.72 etc.), but to motivate the executant.

75 deliciaeque meae: common language of slaves and freedmen: e.g. *CIL* vi 1892.8, 36525.5, Pliny *Ep.* 8.1.2.

Latr- is sometimes found as a name: *IGUR* 1 160.Bg (2nd cent. AD) Λάτριος, *CIL* vi 6045 *Latris*. The meaning 'serve' is emphasized to contrast with the coming manumission: she will have no new mistress (76). Manumission is frequent in wills, and implied for the loyal freedwomen mourning on the Tomb of the Haterii; see Sinn and Freyberger (26n. above) 46–7).

77–8 *C.* slips in briefly what is for the reader of the book a central issue. *ure*, at the start of the pentameter, surprises: burning would more naturally be motivated by the woman's horror at abuse or the poet's disgust at his praise. Cf. Catullus 36 (Lesbia), Hor. *C.* 1.16.1–4 (palinode); Tib. 1.9.47–50 (praise of boy regretted; cf. P. 3.24.1–8). *C.*'s attitude offers a remarkable combination. Her relation with P. through his poetry is bounded by death (49–50, contrast e.g. 2.34.93–4); her relation through her love is not (93–4). His love is more important to her than his poetry.

habere possesses various meanings here. Primarily, as fits with the normal point of burning books and with 50, it means 'celebrate', cf. Cic. *Att.* 13.38.1 *laudibus, quas ab eo (Brutus) de nobis haberi . . . renuntiauerunt*, *TLL* s.v. *habeo* 2442.1–3.50. (So too W. Stroh, *Die römische Liebeselegie als werbende Dichtung* (Amsterdam 1971) 182.) But also 'have': with a play on *meas*, the *laudes* belong to her, as *meo . . . nomine* suggests; cf. 2.24.2 (*cum*) *tua sit toto Cynthia lecta foro* (whether or not a title like Antimachus' *Lyde*; cf. Asclep. *AP* 9.63 (*HE* 958–61): Ἀύδη both work and person).

79–80 pelle: Sandbach's *pone* (*CQ* 12 (1962) 273–4) would make C. demand ivy. Some epigrams contain a wish for ivy to grow on poets' tombs, as a Dionysiac symbol of the poets' connections with drama or parties: so Dioscor. *AP* 7.708 (*HE* 1617–22). P. associates ivy garlands with himself too (4.1.61–2n.). But even if the adornment were suitable to the grave of a poet's subject (C.), and *pone hederam tumulo* were suitable to Roman tombs, it is not clear that C. desires this emphasis on P.'s poetry about her. She has told him to burn it, and the epitaph she requests contrasts with it in brevity (*sed breue* 84). The poetic associations of ivy make it all the more suitable for removal (Stroh (77–8n. above) 183–4). Admittedly, it had seemed as though the funeral was recent (*nuper* 4: a vague word). But provided the present assertion *quae . . . alligat* is altered to *ne* (Kenney) . . . *alliget* (anon.), the command can refer beyond the immediate present; the beginnings of some symbolic ivy need not trouble us unduly in time-scale. *alliget ossa* does not have to be pleasant for the bones; cf. Luc. 9.966–9 on the neglected ruins of Troy. *praegnanie* (Cornelissen) for the cluster suits its alarming fertility. *mollis* (Ω) must be replaced by *mollia* (ς), not *mollis* (ς): C.'s bones are *mollis* to suit her. Cf., more literally, Mart. 5.34.9 *mollia non rigidus caespes tegat ossa* (of a child). *mollis* would overload the ivy with adjectives and leave *ossa* bare.

81–6 Tibur stood in an area full of rich villas; the fall of the river Anio (81) directly under the acropolis provided scenery perceived as spectacular (cf. Hor. *C.* 1.7.1–14; Juv. 3.192). In book 3, P. moved C. from Rome to this select place (3.16.1–4, cf. 2.32.5). Instead of an ordinary inscription on her tomb, C. wants a visible notice in Tibur: publicity not permanence. Pillars were often written on at Pompeii (*CIL* IV 673, 4181–97 etc.); a reward is to be advertised on one at P. 3.23.23–4 (cf. *Dig.* 14.3.11.3). The gesture is strident: C. will enhance the glory of a well-known place, lauded by Horace.

This is unlikely to be an inscription on the tomb; rather, the graffito is a distorted version of such inscriptions. Since 81–2 come after the mention of the tomb, they are not defining the tomb's location; they separate the writing from the tomb (a comma after 80 would not be attractive). They denote the city, which is where the conspicuous pillar would be. Pillars could indeed be a part or the central feature of a tomb, like that of Septumia (Augustan?) outside the Porta di Vesuvio at Pompeii (G. Spano, *Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità* 1910 406–11; more generally H. von Hesberg, *Römische Grabbauten* (Darmstadt 1992) 121–201). But even if C. casually presupposes the building of such an impressive tomb, one would expect a premeditated epitaph to be written on a base, not an actual pillar. *hic* in the corrupt 85, if sound, is not limited to the tomb: it is expanded by 'earth of Tibur' (cf. *TLL* s.v. *hic* 2756.64–2757.20). So at 3.18.3 *qua iacet* . . . *Misenus* refers to the bay of Baiae in general, not the precise location of the tomb. One could, though, read *hac* (ς); the corruption, with *iacet*, would be natural. An inscription in Tibur is compatible with the passenger driving swiftly from Rome (cf. Lucr. 3.1063–7, *OLD* s.v. *curro* 3b); if the present *currens* is pressed strictly, he is hurrying into the

town, or through it to a villa or the Via Valeria. Or one could assign the pillar to C.'s villa at Tibur, passed before the town walls (81–2, esp. 82, should still refer to Tibur in general); cf. F. Coarelli in *Properzio tra storia arte mito* (Assisi 2004) 110–15, 4.8 intro.

81–2 On Tibur see C. F. Giuliani and Z. Mari, *Tibur* (Florence 1966–91); M. A. Tomei in *Misurare la terra* (Rome 1985) 1107–9. For its orchards see also N–H on Hor. C. 1.7.13. Hercules Victor, who creates a link with 4.9, had a large sanctuary outside the city walls; cf. 2.32.5 *Herculeum . . . Tibur*, Giuliani and Mari 1164–201, III 235–8, C. F. Giuliani, *Tivoli. Il santuario di Ercole Vincitore* (Tivoli 2004), *CIL* XIV 3541–55. It is because of him (*Herculeo numine*) that the air of Tibur keeps ivory from losing its brightness (see *OLD* s.v. *palleo* 2b); for this notion cf. Sil. 12.229–30 etc. Untarnished beauty suits the golden C. (85).

81 ramosis . . . pomifer: see Heyworth on these epithets (*populifer*, probably, of a river, Ov. *Am.* 2.17.32).

83 hoc (IT) rather than *hic* (NA) is wanted by the dictated lines 85–6, which are *not* to be composed by the narrator.

media: for easy reading and visibility; contrast Luc. 8.821–2.

dignum me: P.'s poetry is not needed for the *carmen* to be worthy of C. Contrast Gall. fr. 2.6–7 Courtney (updated text in M. Capasso, *Il ritorno di Cornelio Gallo* (Naples 2003) 41, 50):]...*i. tandem fecerunt c[ar]mina Musae | quae possem domina deicere digna mea.*

84 quod currens uector ab urbe legat: cf. 4.2.57–64, 57–8nn.; C. is less long-winded than Vertumnus.

85 †sed . . . hic†: the exact form of words is unknown; cf. Heyworth.

aurea: 'golden' is used of a woman at Philod. *AP* 5.123.3 (14 Sider); but the word perhaps pointedly matches C. with the chaste and lovely Cydippe from P.'s model Callimachus (fr. 75.30–1 Pfeiffer). It also recalls the gold of the portrait now destroyed, 47.

86 laus: the river Anio will be praised because of C.; cf. Sil. 5.173 *uenit laus quanta!* Again, P.'s *laudes* of her (78) can be dispensed with.

87–92 C. affirms her speech is true: cf. Ov. *Ex P.* 3.4.98 *iam pondus dices omen habere meum* (a prophetic poem). Unusually, yet coherently, she depicts all souls as wandering ghosts, but only the righteous as reliable. *piis . . . portis* (87, cf. *pia . . . sede Culex* 375 etc.) adapts Virgil's gates of true and false dreams to fit C.'s moral self-depiction (*Aen.* 6.893–6, near end of book, as of this speech and poem, cf. Hom. *Od.* 19.562–7; S. Kyriakidis, *Narrative structure and poetics in the Aeneid* (Bari 1998) 23–43 for complication on *Aeneid* 6 and closure). For ghosts, cf. D. Ogden, *Magic, witchcraft, and ghosts in the Greek and Roman worlds* (Oxford 2002) ch. 8.

88 uenerunt, somnia: this punctuation is called for by the rarity of pause in the second half of the pentameter when there is none at the caesura (4.4.73n.). It also sharpens the paradox: the dream and the shade have weight (*onus* 92 makes

the same play; cf. Ov. *Rem.* 688 . . . *crede, nec aetherios pondus habere deos*). The allusion at Ov. *Met.* 9.495–6 supports: *quod autem | somnia pondus habent? an habent et somnia pondus? pia* is predicative ('if they are righteous when they come'), cf. e.g. 2.25.28 *si qua uenit sero, magna ruina uenit*.

89–94 C. avoids sounding too powerless, and does not directly admit that *she* is running out of time *now*, though 93 partly implies this. Contrast the dead at e.g. Call. fr. 191.32–5 Pfeiffer (alas, back to Acheron soon), Virg. *Aen.* 5.738–9 (day at hand), Hor. *Sat.* 2.5.109–10 *sed me | imperiosa trahit Proserpina*. The coming of ghosts, especially in dreams, is naturally associated with night, here emphasized; night, a fundamental notion in the Propertian world of love, now has a different point for C. Cf. (with repetition) 1.3.37–40 *meae . . . noctis | . . . tales . . . noctes . . .*

89–90 All the underworld is a prison, guarded by Cerberus; with wild but logical imagination, P. lets him out too. Cf. Sen. *HF* 57 *carcere umbrarum* (with Billerbeck); Milton, *Nativ.* 229–34: ghosts at dawn 'Troop to th'infernall jail'. For Cerberus as *ianitor*, *custos*, *custos carceris diri* cf. Virg. *Aen.* 6.400, 424, Sen. *Thy.* 16. The dog and door-keeper of a different existence are contrasted (4.5.47–8, 73–4, cf. 4.5.3–4).

abiecta is strange with *sera* 'bolt' (cf. *TLL* s.v. *abicio* 87.16–46); possibly *reiecta* (Hutchinson).

91 luce: 4.6 had ended with daybreak, in happy satiety. The heavy alliteration marks the paradoxical conjunction of light with the necessity of going to the underworld.

Lethaea ad stagna: the waters of the underworld in general; but the mention of Lethe and water brings out by contrast how far C. is from forgetting.

92 uehimur: contrast *ferimur* 89 (active movement by ghosts).

nauta: also of Charon 3.18.31, Virg. *Aen.* 6.385 etc. But with *recenset* ('checks' the number is right) it conveys a prosaic image of underworld control.

93–4 C. had seemed powerless in 89–92; but she asserts power over the narrator. She has more power than the living Chloris: her own possession will last far longer (contrast the use of *nunc* in 40). *tenebo* suggests an embrace; but it reverses *tenet* 72.

mixtis has various contexts: (i) the mixing of Achilles' and Patroclus' bones (Hom. *Il.* 23.83–91 and *Od.* [24].76–9); (ii) ordinary practice with loved ones (so *CIL* VI 20569; a glass vessel with bones mixed, *CIL* XIII 4640); (iii) the imagining by C. and the narrator in books 1–2 of holding, missing, spurning, the other's bones (1.17.12, 22, 19.18, 2.8.20 (cf. 23 *permiscuit*, 9.14, 14.6), 24b.35–6). Patroclus requests the mixing; C. assumes it: she has overcome the narrator. *mixtis*, like *teram*, also has sexual meaning (cf. 19; J. N. Adams, *The Latin sexual vocabulary* (London 1982) 180–1; 183–4, 219 (*tero*)). *tero* is much lower in register, and the bones make the embrace ghastly and dominating; *teram* | advances on *tenebo* |. The loving conjunction of remains and people (cf. e.g. Soph. *El.* 1165–9, Ov. *AA* 3.21 (Evadne) *cineres miscebinur*) is pushed in a sinister direction.

95 'When she had finished this speech, with [cf. *OLD* s.v. *sub* 11a] its complaint and dispute.' The overtones of *lis* and *perago* suggest a legal attack (cf. *OLD* s.v. *perago* 12). Event and poem deny the narrator a reply; but he implies her unfairness. She concludes, rather than being forced to stop; she and nature together refuse him an embrace (contrast 94). Complaint is so like her (1.3.18, 6.7–11, 3.6.18, 35).

96 The typical epic end to meeting with a dear ghost gains a special point with lovers, all the more so after 94. The ghost's 'light, spirit nature' (Sch. Hom. bT *Il.* 23.100) contrasts with the rubbing bones. In Hom. *Il.* 23.97–102 the failed embrace leads to the reflections that begin this poem, and to organizing the funeral; that increases the abruptness here. At Virg. *Aen.* 2.790–4 Aeneas' failure to embrace his dead wife marks the end of their relationship (cf. 784); the narrator's relationship with C. has not ended.

4.8: CYNTHIA II

Cynthia dead is followed by Cynthia alive – last night (1). This unexpected order has created puzzlement; the most attractive answer has seemed to be that P. is deliberately demonstrating the fictionality of Cynthia (C.) by resurrecting her at will. However, the order of the poems diverges from their chronology. 4.8 belongs to an earlier stage in C.'s fictional career, when she is still leaving Rome for day-trips to nearby towns: cf. 2.32.5–6 *cur ita te Herculeum deportant esseda Tibur?* | *Appia cur totiens te Via Lanuvium?* She has not yet moved to Tibur (3.16, 4.7; for the possible historical inspiration cf. *Il* IV 134 no. 346, Apul. *Apol.* 10.3, Coarelli (4.7.81–6n.): Hostia at Tibur?). 4.7 also shows the climax of a feud with Lygdamus, less advanced in 4.8. Cf. Horace, *Epode* 12, set two years or more before 11 (11.4–5, 12.14–16). This inverted chronology gives a key, as will be seen, to understanding the roles of the poem in the book.

The order remains a surprise. 4.7 had seemed to offer decisive closure. More specifically, C.'s command to burn poems on her made the reader suppose no more poems on C. would follow in the book. But the strategy of surprise is itself characteristic of book 4. The central figure of each new poem is a surprise; this figure is supremely surprising precisely through being the same as the one before.

Chronological criss-crossing too is essential to the book. 4.3–4.5 or 4.8–4.9 illustrate this. In the 'modern' sequence 4.5–4.8, the event of 4.6 (Actium) is earlier than that of 4.5 or 4.7. In the overlapping 'epic' set 4.6–4.9, the earlier of the poems starting from *Aeneid* 8 (6) comes after the main action of the *Aeneid*, the later (9) before. The imitated poems come in the elaborate order *Aeneid*, *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, *Aeneid*. (Even the sequence *Iliad*, *Odyssey* is accompanied by the use in 4.8 of an earlier point within its epic's structure: the violent revenge of Odysseus in *Odyssey* 22, as against Patroclus' ghost in *Iliad* 23, which begins the ending after the violent revenge of Achilles in *Iliad* 22.) One point of temporal interweaving in book 4 is to show complex relations between different periods – above all morally. 4.8 does this in itself, with its graphically modern restaging of epic and

history, and its inset ancient ritual. The order 4.7–4.8 further invites a complex response to the affair, revising what seemed the final revision. The confounding of temporal sequence also highlights the generic complication of the book, in relation to both epic and elegy: the narrative cohesion of epic is evaded, but the book is obsessed with narrative and time.

The generic complications of this poem are striking. Within the opposition between aetiological and amatory elegy, the poem arrestingly incorporates ritual, but transfers the concern with causes to the love-plot. The poem opens explaining what caused the tumult last night (1); proceeds abruptly to a strange ritual which is *not* explained (contrast e.g. 4.10.1, 45 *causa(s)*); then immediately evaluates the *causae* of C.'s behaviour (16). Later it presents C.'s instructions, which are intended, like Hercules' at 9.67–70, to determine future behaviour, and paints the *causa* of C.'s grievances (79). The poem also perhaps recreates and extends the original cause of the narrator's love (1.1.1); love, caused and causing, had interested Callimachus' *Aetia* itself (fr. 67–75, 80–3, 110 Pfeiffer). But P. is not simply mingling elegiac sub-genres: love invades generic territory.

The range of genres deployed in the poem is large: not only epic and mime, but history, Plato's *Symposium*, Virgil's tenth *Eclogue* (itself a work where generic domains are playfully disputed). Love-poetry, parodically and ludically, appropriates new regions. Significant too is the exploration of love-poetry itself. The figure of Teia makes the party a distorted evocation of the light-hearted Anacreon, and perhaps his inheritor Horace. The narrator's trespass offers us, on a metaliterary level, a version of love-poetry without C.: a trivial and lifeless business, unredeemed by a Callimachean dwarf. C. is what gives P.'s love-poetry its energy (cf. 2.30.40 *nam sine te nostrum non ualet ingenium*).

The poem presents a novel departure for Propertian love-elegy. P. had made intense use of metaphor, and mythological comparisons, to describe love. The metaphors are now turned into a literal but symbolic narrative of violence. And, as in 4.7, an epic and mythological narrative is re-enacted with new characters. The generic conquest by love harmonizes with C.'s conquest, which corresponds to the conquests in 4.6 and 10.

Thematically, the new form disrupts what had seemed so far in the book relatively fixed categories of public and private and especially male and female. (Vertumnus had prefigured the confusion of sex; Arethusa and Cleopatra had weakly anticipated it.) Real public community and religion are relegated to a small town outside Rome; the private world of love turns into the figurative siege of a city, and C. becomes a Roman general. The inversion of sexes goes beyond even the earlier books. The terror of the girls at the masculine snake is closely mirrored by the narrator's terror at C.'s reappearance (pallor and hands: 9, 12, 53–4). The final ritual is imposed by a woman. The narrator's chastity is important, like the Lanuvian girls'. He is discovered at home with lovers by a woman who has been away: scenes where *husbands* inconveniently appeared were evidently common in mime (cf. Ov. *Tr.* 2.497–500, 505–6). Relevant too is

the very recent *Lex Iulia* on adultery. In this a husband is expected to take legal action against the wife, and may take physical action against the lover, if they are caught in his house (C. acts as if she owned the narrator's). Cf. *RS* 60 and *Dig.* 48.5.2.2, 25 *pr.*-1; C. Fayer, *La familia romana* III (Rome 2005) 221–55. C.'s roles as epic hero and toughly legalistic general add to the overturning of gender. Hierarchies are, through comedy, subverted and questioned.

For all C.'s dynamism and masculine physical action, the contrast with her physical powerlessness in 4.7 works in two directions, by chronology as well as order. So a pathetic irony hangs over her present mastering of the house. The order itself emphasizes the limits of her emotional power over the narrator. The existence of 4.8 shows he has disregarded her command to burn poems in 4.7; we know from 4.7 that he will disregard her command to sell Lygdamus in 4.8. And on a level above the narrator's, the comedy of the poem ends the Cynthia poetry of book 4 with particular lightness and detachment.

Some discussions: S. Evans, *G&R* 18 (1971) 51–3; H. MacL. Currie, *Latomus* 32 (1973) 616–22; J. Turpin, *REL* 51 (1973) 159–71; Hubbard (1974) 152–6; J. H. Dee, *TAPA* 108 (1978) 41–53; J. C. McKeown, *PCPS* 205 (1979) 74–8; J. W. Allison, *CP* 75 (1980) 332–8; A. Dalzell, *Hermathena* 129 (1980) 33–4; M. Komp, *Absage an Cynthia* (Frankfurt 1988) chs. 1, 2.2, 2.3, 3; Fox (1996) 166–9; J. Warden, *Phoenix* 50 (1996) 118–29; Janan (2001) ch. 7; Rambaux (2001) 300–3; Wyke (2002) 103–7; DeBrohun (2003) 143–6.

1–2 'Learn what put the Esquiline rich in water to flight last night, when a crowd next to the new fields ran.' The 'crowd' (an exaggeration) had been in the narrator's house; cf. e.g. *Ov. Met.* 8.849 for *uicinus* of merely temporary proximity.

disce, unexpected of one new event, makes gossip aetiology (*Ov. F.* 3.436 etc.).

Esquilias: P. (3.23.24), Virgil, Horace lived near Maecenas, P. and Virgil at least next to his park, which reused a burial-ground. Cf. R. Ch. Häuber, *Kölner Jahrb.* 23 (1990) 11–107, *LTUR* II 116, 165, 212, 234–5, III 70–4, *MAR* 119–21, 145. The scene suggests the end of Horace, *Satires* 1.8 (cf. *currere* 47), set on Maecenas' and Horace's Esquiline. *aquosas* may suggest a water-feature; *agris*, unusual of a park, may suggest paradoxical reversion to the country. Book 4 gets no closer to naming Maecenas.

hac nocte: contrast the night of 4.7 (and those of 4.3, 4.4, 4.6.69–86).

fugarit: the hyperbole, explained in the pentameter, alludes to Call. *Hy.* 4.70–8, where places literally 'flee' (φεύγει) at the will of a jealous female, Hera.

cucurrit: a surprise for onlookers. Cf. 61–2, Pliny *Ep.* 1.12.9 *cucurri*.

3–14 Lanuvium is 30 km from Rome. The ritual is connected with Juno Sospita (> *Seispes*, *ILLRP* 170). Cf. 16; Ael. *NA* 11.16 (with plural girls, as probably in P.: *RRC* nos. 412, 472/3 (girl and snake) prove nothing). P. deceptively makes Juno's cult sound separated from Rome (contrast Livy 8.14.2, with Oakley ad loc.), the

affluent Lanuvium sound a rustic backwater. On Lanuvium, the cult, and the substantial remains of the sanctuary (first half of 1st cent. BC) see G. Bendinelli, *Mon. Ant.* 27 (1921) 293–370; A. E. Gordon, *The cults of Lanuvium* (Berkeley 1938) 21–41; P. Chiarucci, *Lanuvium* (Rome 1983) 53–79; F. Coarelli, *Revixit ars* (Rome 1996) 382–417; M. Lilli, *Lanuvium* (Rome 2001) 53–69.

3 annosi uetus: contrast *nouis* (2).

tutela: a thing under another's protection (*OLD* s.v. 4a).

4 tibi continues *disce* (1). *hic ubi* (Ω) would demand a specific fact about Lanuvium.

tam rarae non perit hora morae 'an hour's stop for such an unusual reason is not a waste'. *non perit* is guide-book talk: ἄξιον ἄξιον 'worth seeing' is common in Pausanias; cf. *Ov. Am.* 3.13.5 *grande morae pretium*. The tourist's entertainment, like the farmers' practicality (12) and the snake's greed, contrasts with the girls' terror. It is hard to justify the combination of *morae* and *tam rarae* (whether 'so unusual' or 'so exquisite'); N's *rapae* strengthens suspicion that a different word has been lost.

5–6 One *qua* must go. With 5 as main clause, 3–10 form a version of an ekphrastic sequence. If *hic* in 5 (Hutchinson), the name (3) is followed by two *hics* in anaphora, one developing the other, and a topographical description (5), itself taken up by 'where' (6). Cf. e.g. 4.6.15–20, *Hom. Il.* 2.811–15 (name and description taken up by 'here'/'there'); e.g. *P.* 3.22.40–1, *Ov. Am.* 2.10.16–17, *AA* 2.490–1 for anaphora from pentameter to hexameter. *huc* (15) finally resumes. Heyworth's *nam* gives another variation. If *abripitur* needs to be changed, one could begin the real ekphrasis at 5 and read *est* (Hutchinson) . . . *abruptus* (Heinsius). 5 as subordinate clause (with *qua* in 5 and *hac* (Heinsius) in 6) would oddly over-emphasize the exact place, and require meaning to change between *qua* (where) and *hac* (by this way).

sacer abripitur caeco descensus hiatu 'a holy way down is made sheer by a dark chasm'. *abripitur* would have to be a bold imitation of Gk. ἀπρότομος, ἀπορρώξ (*Call. Hec.* fr. 199.2–3 Hollis) 'cut away, sheer'; the site shows it is not a downwards procession 'interrupted' by the portion in the dark. The entrance to the place of the offering has been plausibly identified (Chiarucci (3–4n.) 260–2); it is part of a portico in the sanctuary.

uirgo: a stern Callimachean warning, cf. *Hy.* 5.51–2 ('Argive man, do not . . .'). But the emphatic *tale . . . omne* may suggest a little scepticism on the official promise (13).

7 The enjambement, after parenthesis and couplet-end, highlights horror and expresses difficulty. *uirgo* should not be in apposition to *honos*, a concrete offering; cf. e.g. *Sil.* 13.434 *fundunt . . . lactis honorem*, *TLL* s.v. *honos* 2924.61–2925.22.

serpentis: snakes seem to be devoid of phallic symbolism for Romans. Cf. J. N. Adams, *The Latin sexual vocabulary* (London 1982) 30–1 (even the two positive examples are delusive).

8 annua heightens *ieiuni*, but stresses unlikelihood. The snake's meals are more frequent in *Ael. NA* 11.16.

ex ima sibila torquet humo ‘hurls hisses from the depths’ (cf. Stat. *Theb.* 6.534 *ima* . . . *humus*). *torqueo* of sound: *OLD* s.v. 9c; secondarily, it suits the snake (so too Val. Fl. 7.525–6). ‘The noise is heard through the girls’ ears.

9–10 work better here than transposed after 12. P. seems to imagine plural girls in one year, but focuses on a specimen individual in 11–12. The summarizing *talìa* would interrupt awkwardly after 12, and *pallent* would provide a superfluous restatement.

demissae: contrast C.’s less timid and virginal descent to her lover’s *colla* (4.7.17–18). *ad sacra* goes with *demissae*: line 10 would be too narrow for *talìa ad sacra pallent*.

tenera (ς) suits girls (3.3.33–4 (*manus*), Ov. *Med.* 51 etc.); its juxtaposition with *anguino* is mimetic. *temere* (Ω) does not seem to mean ‘accidentally’ of a single act, rather than a random distribution.

raditur ‘is brushed’: *OLD* s.v. 5.

11 The eager *corripit* (cf. *ieiuni* 7) contrasts with the tentative *admotas*.

12 canistra: food was commonly served in baskets, and so in offerings of food to sacred beings.

ipsa: as if, fantastically, the girl’s fear even communicated itself to the basket. Shackleton Bailey (on 4.8.54) sees the use here as just adding an imprecise liveliness.

13–14 Ael. *NA* 11.2 (in Epirus) the snakes, if they welcome the priestess and her food, point to ‘prosperity and a year without disease’. P. omits the converse.

clamantque: the farmers’ joyful shout at coming prosperity when the girls return contrasts with Teia’s shout at imagined catastrophe when C. returns (*clamat* 58). These are the only pieces of direct speech before C.’s (73–80).

agricolae: contrast the artificial countryside of Maecenas’ park (*agris* 2), compare the rural past conserved in the Parilia (4.4.73–8).

15–16 C.’s alleged behaviour contrasts with the chaste girls’; by contrast with the rite, Celtic ponies (cf. Cinna fr. 9 Courtney) show modern trade and luxury. The Via Appia was good for showing off these fast, expensive animals: cf. Hor. *Epod.* 4.14 *Appiam mannis terit* (with Watson ad loc.), and Lucr. 3.1063–7 (from Rome to country).

causa fuit Iuno gives epic resonance, cf. Virg. *Aen.* 1.8–11. Juno’s rival Venus promptly deflates. Penetration to the deepest cause also parodies historiography (Thuc. 1.23.5–6). For religious excuses cf. 2.32.8–10. The line displays jealous certainty.

The warlike cult-statue of Juno Sospita (Cic. *ND* 1.82 etc.) has some relevance to C.; but her chariot on *RRC* nos. 379, 480/23 is common for deities on coins.

17 The call to the Via Appia suggests both the opening invocation of a Muse and an advocate’s appeal to a witness (*teste*; with the polite *dic, quaeso* cf. e.g. Cic. *Vér.* 4.143 (there ironic)). It raises the question whether the narrator is a witness himself, or is creating the scene from his imagination. At the most he has only seen her leave.

triumphum: cf. Livy 34.3.9, Cato on women in real carts figuratively triumphing over the law that would restrict their luxury. Here the triumph symbolizes C.'s general success in love, and her mastery over the narrator. Clodia's abuse of the Via Appia (Cic. *Cael.* 34) is thus made masculine and public. There is a pointed contrast with 4.6.65 *quantus mulier foret una triumphus!* The Via Appia, which starts from the Porta Capena, links C. with Lycotas and his army's literal triumph (4.3.67–72).

18 effusis 'careering' (*OLD* s.v. *effusus* 3).

[19–20] The couplet is an irrelevant and damaging interruption. It does not fit well after 2 either (Lütjohann): the *rixa* cannot be the battle with Cynthia (the narrator was there, and it was not in a *taberna*), and a *rixa* in the girls' refuge (cf. 62) would be unmotivated. Nor would the reader need a wrangle in an obscure tavern explained (1–2). Furthermore, *arcana* means 'secret', not 'obscure'; it is no doubt inspired by *obscurae* in 62. Hence the lines are less likely to be a parallel from the margin; they might be an interpolation, once in the margin, then misplaced. But possibly they seek to prepare a source for the *iocos* of 22 (or identify the *impuros* . . . *locos*), and make explicit the narrator's absence from the trip.

21–2 'Sitting, herself a show to watch, she hung over, at the furthest end of the yoke-pole, audaciously wielding the reins, with filthy jokes.' C., although sitting as the cart requires, is not the seated audience but the show (cf. 56n.): horse-races are now drawn on as well as triumphs. For the position cf. (of standing charioteers) Virg. *Aen.* 5.147, Man. 5.77 *prorum*, Sidon. *Carm.* 23.350–5 . . . *nec cernas cilo cernuos magistros | temones mage sufferant an axes*; J. H. Humphrey, *Roman circuses* (London 1986) 183 fig. 83 ('Campana' plaque from Louvre). Hence *primo*, as rhetoric demands, denotes that part of the pole joining yoke to chariot which is most distant from the driver, not nearest.

spectaculum: here and at 56 a striking archaism, also found in Aug. *RG* 23 (-cul- *ibid.* app. 4, *ILLRP* 645.4 (c. 80 BC); *spectacula* Plaut. *Cure.* 647, -culum *Poen.* 209 line-end). The suffix -culum (< *-tlom) is earlier than -culum: cf. Umbrian *pihactu*, *Tab. Iguv.* VIa 25 etc. (Leumann (1977) 102–3, 313–14); Fr. *spectacle* is a later development. Virgil's *oraculum* and *gubernaculum* (*Aen.* 3.143, 5.859) at least have precedents in Catullus and Lucretius. The narrator uses the grandiose form with irony here but not at 56.

impuros is too strong a word for ribaldry from passers-by, or for the Via Appia (*locos*). For *per* cf. *per iocum* 'jokingly' and Cat. 50.6 *per iocum atque uinum*. The scope for obscene jokes in the situation was considerable; cf. Brown on Lucr. 4.1196. C. herself provides an equivalent to the soldiers' rude songs at a triumph.

23–4 The unmanly profligate (*OLD* s.v. *nepos* 4) is not driving his own cart (*carpenta* pl. for sing., as often with *currus*); contrast the youth and girl in Juv. 1.58–62. Plucked body-hair shows effeminacy too (Townsend on Suet. *Jul.* 45.2). The inversion of gender will be replayed by C. and the narrator.

†siriganam†: Heyworth rightly doubts *serica nam* (ς). P., he observes, does not postpone *nam*, and *serica* should be 'made of silk'. A negative for *taceo* is

desirable here (or for *taceas* (Hutchinson), continuing the address to the Via Appia). Otherwise, even *praeteritio*, revealing while affecting not to, would imply there was more to be said about cart and dogs; this does not seem clear or effective rhetoric. For *nec* . . . *atque* cf. e.g. Virg. *G.* 2.101–2. *Gallica* (initial *s/g* confusion 2.13.48) or *lucida* (Hutchinson) are mere possibilities.

armillatos colla Molossa ‘braceleted on their Molossian necks’. Acc. of respect (H–S 36–8). A dog’s collar should be *cingulum* or *collare*; these vigorous animals (Enk on Grat. 187) have an ornament on their necks, something effeminate in men (Juv. 2.85 etc.).

25 ‘He will give his span of life for sale to the foul gladiators’ stodge.’ An oath (*auktoramentum*) will effectively enslave him to the manager (*lanista*). Cf. B. Levick, *JRS* 73 (1983) 97–115; [Quint.] *Decl. Min.* 302. To heighten the shame, the *se* that we would expect as object of *dabit* is replaced by *fata* (*OLD* s.v. *fatum* 4a); *lanista* is replaced by the humiliating special food ([Quint.] *Decl. Mai.* 9.5 *gravior omni fame sagina*). The narrator’s scorn for enslavement will later prove ironic.

26 ubi suggests the poverty will result from puberty; but *erasas* and *uulsi* (23) preclude this. Nor is wearing a beard a natural consequence of being a gladiator. Rather, the money of a *nepos* is lost through extravagance (cf. e.g. Cic. *Quinct.* 40). The beard neglected in grief, an opposite extreme from the plucking (cf. Mart. 2.36), is another consequence of the poverty. So *et* (Hutchinson) would be preferable; for *-et* cf. e.g. 1.16.32, 2.3.44, 4.1.54.

pudenda ‘shameful’: because the cause is shameful? The application seems strained. One might even wonder if *putenda* (Π) points to *putanda*, a verb satirically transferred from plants. At all events, the narrator sounds jealous of the rival’s looks.

27–8 At this point, the action sounds radical: an actual abandonment of C. Cf. 1.1.36 *neque assueto mutet amore locum (torum Otto). castra mouere* (*TLL* s.v. *castra* 554.39–79) indicates a decisive change of amorous territory by the lover as commander (2.14.23–4, Ov. *Am.* 2.12) – not, as usual, the soldier of C. or of Love. The phrase expresses metaphorically the same act as *mutato* . . . *toro*, despite the perf. part.; cf. Housman on Man. 3.615, with *addenda*. In justification of the act, 27 presents the trip of 15–26 as only one of many: cf. 2.32.3–6 (various places; Lanuvium *totiens*).

29 Phyllis: a common freedwoman’s name; one of a pair for partying with at Virg. *Ecl.* 10.37–41. The meaning ‘leafy’ connects her with Chloris in 4.7, a rival C. will be less able to oust. Her proximity to the goddess of chastity is comic. The temple, lately rebuilt (*LTUR* II 11–13, *MAR* 101), recalled Rome’s early ascendancy in Latium (Varro *LL* 5.43 etc.).

est: the ekphrasis on C.’s destination, and on the narrator’s women, contrast (*his* in 33 matches *huc* in 15). The women are like features of modern Rome.

30 omne decet ‘anything is seemly’ (she has no inhibitions). For the sing. cf. e.g. Ov. *Her.* 4.134 *fas omne facit* (Juno’s incest makes everything allowable); for the force of *omnis* (however bad) see *OLD* s.v. 7b, Cat. 75.4 *omnia si facias*, opposite of

si optima fias. Cf. 32. The vulgar tone suggests the narrator's low standards here. Not 'she is all charm' (Goold); neither *omne* nor *deceit* can be so used in Latin.

31 Tarpeios . . . inter lucos takes us back to Tarpeia (4.4) and to Romulus, whose asylum was on the Capitol *inter duos lucos* (*LTUR* 1 130, *MAR* 58–9). His asylum was often seen as a refuge for base elements (Livy 1.8.5–6, *Ov. F.* 2.140, 3.429–33, *Plut. Rom.* 9.3, E. Dench, *Romulus' asylum* (Oxford 2005) 14–21).

stat: the omission in N and the separation of *inter* from adj. and noun indicate that Π's *est inter* is a false guess. *stat* (Heyworth, Hutchinson), if correct, mingles house and person (cf. *uicina* (29); *OLD* s.v. *sto* 13a, 15). Prostitution comes in only as an innuendo; the need for drink to transform the women's appetite implies they have a slightly higher status.

Teia: a very rare name (Teios *SEG* 48.508 (Messene 2nd cent. BC), *IG* II² 7787 (Imperial, family from Ancyra)). It must evoke Anacreon of Teos, also keen on love with drink. Cf. e.g. fr. 396 Page (58n.): drink as a preliminary to love; *Ov. Tr.* 2.363–4 *quid nisi cum multo Venerem confundere uino | praecepit lyrici Teia Musa senis?* His drunken statue was famous (G. Richter, *Greek Portraits* (London 1965) 176–8, P. Zanker, *The Mask of Socrates* (Berkeley 1995) 22–30). The party becomes parodic.

32 candida 'good-hearted' (*OLD* s.v. 8a). 'White-skinned *but*' would imply her lust was unattractive; yet if it was, why invite her? Cf. 30.

non satis unus erit: male amusement at female desire is suggested. But 2.22a.36 *nobis una puella parum est*, and the narrator's plural invitation, add ironies.

33 noctem lenire: the narrator's plans now sound more limited. *lenire* suggests unsatisfied desire for C. Cf. Tib. 1.5.37 *curas* (for Delia) *depellere uino*.

uocatis: the two women, and the suggestions of 34, make this sleazier than the Horatian invitations of women (C. 1.17, 4.11; 2.11.21–4 (with N–H), 3.14.21–4).

34 'To make my deceit novel with new objects of love' and 'with unfamiliar kinds of sex' (two women at once). Cf. *OLD* s.v. *nouo* 4a. *furta* admits guilt; the affair with C. is not now secretive enough to be included in the word (on [Tib.] 3.11.7 see Tränkle). Literary innovation is also in the air.

35–6 Standard arrangements for banquets are played with. The number of diners is the minimum approved by Varro (*Men.* 333 Cèbe); but the only guests are disreputable women. Placing was of intense social interest (cf. *Plut. Quaest. Conv.* 615c–619f), and could be inquired about afterwards (*quaeris*; cf. *Hor. Sat.* 2.8.18–24); but here the positioning has sexual purposes. So, here, does the conventional three to a couch; two to a couch is the norm in Pompeian pictures of voluptuous banquets (K. M. D. Dunbabin, *The Roman Banquet* (Cambridge 2003) 67–8; cf. also M. Roller, *AJP* 124 (2003) 377–422). The location is not the *triclinium* or the country but the innermost part of the house-complex, the garden (with peristyle): the seedy party must be concealed – from C.

lectulus, though originally diminutive, is standard for dining-couches (*OLD* s.v.).

quaeris: probably not *quaeris*?, cf. 1.22.1–2, 2.1.1, 22a.13 (cf. 14), 31.1, 3.13.1. *inter utramque fui* confirms that the inquiry concerned *discubitus*, not *concubitus*. The

word is found at Val. Max. 2.1.9, and is supported by *accubitus* and *secubitus* (rare, found in poetry).

37 ad cyathos: we might expect a random good-looking boy to pour the wine in 'ladles' (cf. N-H on Hor. C. 1.29.8); here, ominously, it is Lygdamus, supposed by C. in 4.7.35–6 to have poisoned her wine. To use *ad cyath-* in poetry may point to Horace (l.c.; cf. intro. to poem).

uitrique 'was of glass', quite a luxurious material: blown glass had not yet spread widely in Italy. Cf. D. Whitehouse, *Roman glass in the Corning Museum of Glass* (New York 1997–2001) 167. Contrast the humble pottery *supellex* at Hor. Sat. 1.6.118. And this is a special set for the summer; cf. *Copa* 29 *aestivo . . . uiro*. The narrator is rich.

38 Methymnaei: especially fine wine, from Methymna on Lesbos, used by the rich 1.14.2, Hor. Sat. 2.8.49–50. It may suggest Lesbian poetry (though Sappho and Alcaeus came from Mytilene) and its recreator Horace; 'Lesbian wine' probably suggests poetry at Hor. C. 1.17.21 (18 *fide Teia* there evokes Anacreon).

saliua 'taste', a connoisseurish and prosaic word, cf. Pliny NH 14.61, 23.40.

39 Nile, tuus: cf. e.g. Tac. Ann. 14.61.4 *tibicinis Aegyptii*. Aulos-players are common on papyri from Egypt: so P. Hibeh 54 (3rd cent. BC), P. Oxy. 2721 (3rd AD).

crotalistria †Phyllis†: castanet-dancing was erotic; cf. Scip. Min. ORF 21 F 30 (appalled), *Copa* 2. A guest on the couch cannot be performing it: *Phyllis* comes from 29. A voc. (*Orontes* Morgan) would be unclear without a *tua* (contrast Virg. Aen. 7.685); it is also needless. Cf. e.g. 3.21.25–6, Virg. Aen. 7.797–8 for nom. and voc. combined. For *Hibera* (Hutchinson) cf. Mart. 6.71.1–2. For music at parties cf. e.g. a painting from the House of the Triclinium, Pompeii (V 2.4; Naples inv. 120030), PPM III 818 no. 47 (two auletes and a female dancer); G. Tintori, *La musica di Roma antica* (Lucca 1996) 137–51.

40 'And the rose, elegant without art, was readily scattered.' Roses, half-personified (cf. e.g. Col. 10.260–1), need no women's ornaments. Not sewn here into a garland, they are easily scattered (*facilis* with inf. e.g. 1.11.12). Pyrrha may be *simplex munditiis* (Hor. C. 1.5.5); but *munda sine arte* is hardly apt for a castanet-dancer (*haec* Baehrens, with two unconnected predicative phrases).

41 Dwarfs were a modern entertainment; they might parody castanet-dancers, or play music (Tintori (39n.) 221–2; funerary altar Florence, Uffizi inv. 987 (2nd cent. AD), G. A. Mansuelli, *Galleria degli Uffizi. Le sculture* (Rome 1958–61) 1220). Cf. Mayor on Juv. 8.32 and 33. This one marks the rhythm of the auloi, cf. Ov. F. 3.536 *iactant . . . ad sua uerba manus*, Calp. Sic. 2.25–7. He grotesquely embodies poetic ideals of smallness.

A joke-name, like *Atlas* (Mart. 6.77.7, Juv. 8.32), should not take the form of a Roman *cognomen* (*Magnus* Ω); this would be unusual even for freedmen. Cf. S. Treggiari, *Roman freedmen during the late Republic* (Oxford 1969) 250–1 and Index II.

contractus (ζ) captures the disproportionate smallness of hands and arms (cf. *truncas*, Stat. *Silv.* 1.6.57–64 (*nodosum . . . globum* 59)). **concretus** (Ω) ‘dense’ makes little sense with *ipse suos . . . in artus*: cf. Heyworth.

43–4 Basic items at feasts become alarming omens. Flickering lamps portend a visitor (Argent. *AP* 6.333 (*GP* 1365–9), Ov. *Her.* 19.151–4), but this is more uncanny when they are full. Less strange is the upsetting of small tables: cross-bars on specimens show awareness that this could happen. But it is a potent side-effect or symbol of disaster in Hom. *Od.* 22.19–21, Aesch. *Ag.* 1600–2. *neque . . . constabat flamma* also symbolizes the narrator’s confused desires; the prostration of the table prefigures the farce to come (69, 71–2).

The overturned table offers the first slight hint of *Odyssey* 22. Depictions of the suitors present a post-Homeric banquet (with couches): this will smooth reading the *Odyssey* back into the party. Cf. esp. Etruscan urns, e.g. Volterra no. 428 (2nd cent. BC); *LIMC* VI 1.631–4.

inque . . . pedes ‘into where its own feet had been’ is even harder with *supina*. Cf. Heyworth. Delayed *-que* has an unusual place in the couplet (Platnauer (1951) 91–2).

45 quoque goes with the whole sentence (cf. 3.11.65 *haec di conciderunt, haec di quoque moenia seruant*); its formal attachment to *me* marks a new focus (cf. 3.13.57 *tu*).

‘Venus’ is a particularly desirable combination of throws with *tali* (animal-bones used as dice); ‘the dog’ is a low throw or combination (*RE* XIII 1959–60). *damnosi* ‘costly’ (Ov. *AA* 2.206, *al.*) humorously reverts to prosaic loss; but *per talos* would be an odd phrase if the narrator were simply seeking the throw ‘Venus’. Through it he seeks the goddess’s favour. (*secundo* (Ω) is caused by *quaerente*; *-os* (ζ) would leave the point unclear.) The narrator is not confident in love; and gaming itself recalls C. (2.33*b*.26 (C.), 3.10.27 8 (dice and love); cf. Gibson on Ov. *AA* 3.353 ff.). The same throw repeated suggests more than chance (Cic. *Div.* 1.23).

46 subsilueret: a comic imitation of real dogs jumping up to their masters.

47 The two halves balance in form and humorously contrast in propriety.

The singing does not put the women on a level with the musicians: guests might sing too (*ego canto*, a banqueting male points out on Naples inv. 120031, *PPM* III 812 no. 38). Virg. *Ecl.* 10.8 *non canimus surdis* is distorted here (see 48n.).

48 An urban reworking of Virg. *Ecl.* 10.37 49: Gallus is kept from parties, complete with love, song, Phyllis and Amyntas, by the thought of Lycoris, who is away with a soldier. (C. herself will be the warrior.) *nunc insanus amor duri me Martis in armis | detinet* (*Ecl.* 10.43–4) describes mental displacement. The narrator’s placing is likewise not literal; cf. e.g. A.R. 2.541–6 (non-literal seeing presented as if literal). *solus*, if sound, means without (in his thought) Phyllis and Teia, whom he should naturally be with as they are present. The word is taken from Virg. *Ecl.* 10.48 on *Lycoris*, who is *sola* though with the soldier, since she should be with Gallus. Since the narrator is mentally waiting (as if excluded) at the gates of Lanuvium, and is not with C., *totus* may be less apt (cf. Goold (1966) 60).

49 Although C.'s arrival will soon link with Odysseus' self-revelation, there are more pointed connections. 'Suddenly, knocking at the front door produced much noise' when Alcibiades crashes in (Plato *Symp.* 212c6–7); but his subjection to Socrates contrasts with C.'s dominance. Such a contrast is produced too by the narrator's nervous entry in 1.3. Other links confirm C.'s power: Hercules, and Pyrrhus in a siege, breaking doors (4.9.14, 61–2, Virg. *Aen.* 2.469–505); hierarchical superiors returning (Plaut. *Most.* 363–88, Livy 1.57.9). C's arrival alone at night does not specially fit the narrator's picture in 15–26.

cum begins what in effect is a new main clause. Cf. K–S II 338–42. Usually with *subito* or *repente* the preceding clause more obviously prepares a *cum* 'inversum' (but cf. Virg. *Aen.* 1.507–12): the surprise is heightened. *postes* neatly replaces *portas* (48).

'In/with their hinge' seems odd or pointless; in such expressions *cardine* normally has adj. or participle (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 6.573 *horrisono*, Ov. *Am.* 1.6.49 *uerso*). For *subiti* (Heinsius) *rauco* (Hutchinson) cf. Ov. *AA* 2.139–40 *pluraque pingebat, subitus cum Pergama fluctus | abstulit. subit- and rauc-* show that *leuia* must be negated (*nec* 5). For *murmura* 'noise' see 4.4.61n.

50 primos . . . lares: the vestibule. Cf. Cic. *Ver.* 2.160, Ov. *F.* 6.301–4 (*primis aedibus, uestibulum*).

51 nec mora cum 'immediately'. Cf. e.g. Stat. *Theb.* 6.887–9; Calp. Sic. 5.29 does not defend *tum*. The narrator felt scruples about door-breaking (2.5.22, 3.25.10).

resupinat 'lays flat' (on their backs, from C.'s perspective; cf. *refringere*, and 56 for the extravagance). *supin-* conveys deviation from (or to) the vertical, and could not be used of just flinging back (Goold). The image fits with supine tables and prostrated men.

52 'Not ornate in her hair, but lovely in her madness.' The fury explains the hair: cf. Ov. *Met.* 8.106–7 (Scylla rejected) *uiolentam transit in iram . . . passis furibunda capillis . . .* Dishevelled rage, unlike dishevelled grief or fear, Ovid does not present as attractive (cf. *AA* 3.501–8, *Met.* 6.167); but anger is typical of the goddess-like C. (2.29a.9 etc.).

53–4 The character's surprise coincides with readerly surprise as the epic intertext at last becomes clear. The 'cup fell from the hand' of the first suitor slain (Hom. *Od.* 22.17); 'pale fear' seized the rest (42). In this version without death, the dropping becomes an act of shock: cf. e.g. 4.4.22, Ov. *Met.* 2.601–2. That suitor had not drunk: whence, according to Dion. Thrax fr. 36 Linke, the proverb 'many things happen between the cup and the edge of the lip' (cf. W. Bühler, *Zenobii Athoi proverbia* v (Göttingen 1999) 517–31). The narrator has gone even further when disaster falls: his lips are open or loosened in drinking the wine itself (cf. e.g. Ov. *Met.* 1.181 *ora . . . soluit* 'opened'). *soluta* suggests the prime interest is not play on the pallor of wine-soaked lips (cf. Shackleton Bailey).

55–6 C. combines divine, female and male. The female itself includes violent anger: a view opposed to Protagoras' notion that μῆνις 'anger' (fem.), first word

of the *Iliad*, is really male (A 28 D–K, cf. 29). The sack too points to the Trojan War; the *Odyssey* is excelled. The thunder (*fulminat*) points to epic Gigantomachy (D. C. Innes, *CQ* 29 (1979) 165–71), and the style that elegists eschew (4.1.134n., Call. fr. 1.20 Massimilla). The sack also draws in Roman history. For its use as an extreme comparison cf. e.g. Livy 29.17.20.

57–8 C.'s means of violence in 57 is archetypally female (so Hor. *C.* 1.6.17–18 (with N–H) nails in *girls'* battles); 58 implies fire, a military threat to a city. Even in 57 the graphic *conicit* recalls an epic weapon. Teia's cry involves a witty generic conquest. It reapplies Anacr. fr. 396.1 Page φέρ' ὕδωρ 'bring [*or* 'come', P. Oxy. 3722 fr. 15 ii.1–5] water' (and wine, slave). The poem famously embodied the anacreontic metre and Anacreon's ethos, here overcome; it starts the mosaic of Anacreon at Autun (2nd cent. AD; M. and A. Blanchard, *REA* 75 (1973) 268–79). Only *aquam*, then, should be highlighted by direct speech. Datives (*uicinis* Barber) are common with *clamo* and speech; and *uicinis* could still reflect a cry 'water, neighbours!' as in Greek (Ar. *Thesm.* 241; for the call *uicini* cf. *CIL* IV 7443). For an isolated noun cf. Ov. *Met.* 12.241 '*arma, arma*'; for the acc. *aquam* cf. Men. *Sic.* 364 'Theron, water, water, quick!' (where ὕδωρ must be acc.). For the familiar cry for water in a fire cf. e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 17.3, [Quint.] *Decl. Mai.* 12.6 (*aquam* M).

59–60 The cause of the disturbance is to be contrasted with C.'s birthday-party at 3.10.26 *publica uicinae perstrepat aura uiae!* *Quirites*, which stresses membership of the citizen body, brings in a public dimension, even more than 58 (cf. W. Schulze, *Kleine Schriften*, 2nd edn. (Göttingen 1966) 178–9; P. Maas, *Kleine Schriften* (Munich 1973) 59). The *Quirites* were formally asked for help against violence (so Petr. 21.1, [Quint.] *Decl. Min.* 379.3; Sen. *Ep.* 15.7 (climax of a quarrel)). At 4.1.13 they were summoned by sound. The suggestion of cities (cf. 56, 58) is in humorous disparity with the prosaic annoyance.

†**lumina**†: the slaves' bringing out of lights is too trivial (cf. 60), and too organized. *iurgia* (Baehrens) would be both insults uttered and the dispute aurally brought outside. *crimina* 'charges' (Goold (1966) 62) does not suit the situation (contrast Ov. *AA* 3.369–80), or *efferre*, which emphasizes the physical bringing forth of sound.

semita: every street, even the small *semitae* (cf. Häuber (1–2n.) 21–30, 98–101 with map 3; Livy 26.10.6 (the Esquiline, though before this period)). Not 'the whole of the small street', which is too weak for the hyperbolic context. 'Resounds with mad . . .' demands *uoce* (Fruter; cf. Goold (1966) 62), as at e.g. Livy 7.6.12.

61 direptisque 'torn'; cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.9.52 *dilaniata comas*. And, when looked back on from 63, 'seized as booty'.

solutis: their girdles taken (cf. G. Sette, *L'abbigliamento* (Rome 2000) 61–2), they look not properly dressed. Cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.1.51, 7.81 (straight from bed).

62 For the enemy, death, so important elsewhere in book 4, is replaced by inglorious concealment. Cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 8.86–7 κατὰ λαύρας . . . πτώσονται (the

defeated) 'lurk in alleyways', Cic. *Pis.* 53 (Piso's ashamed return) *nonne tibi nox erat pro die . . . , caupona pro oppido . . . ?* C.'s triumphal ride along the conspicuous Via Appia contrasts.

63 exuuiis links C. with the male victors of 4.10 (*exuuiis* 6); cf. also 9.18.

uictrixque: the rivals were the foe; cf. 2.9*b*.49–52, Cat. 37.13, Hor. *C.* 3.20. The two men are like the population left in a captured city (cf. 70), who were brutally treated by the Romans (A. Ziolkowski in J. Rich and G. Shipley (edd.), *War and society in the Roman world* (London 1993) 69–91). C. shows no guilt at violence in love, unlike elegiac narrators.

64 †perversa† can hardly denote the back of the hand; and that would be less suitable for wounding (cf. e.g. Ov. *AA* 3.239–40 *sauciat ora | unguibus*). *uesana* (Heinsius; cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.7.4) is perhaps too close to *insana* (60) in the same position. *purpurea* (Hutchinson) would mean crimson with blood: cf. *OLD* s.v. 2*b*, Val. Fl. 3.107 *purpuream . . . hastam*; Luc. 9.663 *rubentem*; Ov. *Met.* 11.23 *cruentatis . . . dextris*. The martial conception of 63 would be continued.

sauciat: the narrator's account of his own treatment (64–7) is full of verbs with C. as subject, unlike 57–62 and 68–70 (only 57). This is a personal encounter.

65 imponitque . . . collo carries a secondary suggestion of subjection, and also echoes the *impositis* of 1.1.4 (Love placed his feet on my head).

cruentat: savagery replaces love-bites (3.8.21–2, 4.3.25–6, 5.39–40).

66 oculos . . . ferit: language running through the Cynthia poetry now becomes fiercely literal. Her eyes captured him (1.1.1); she captured his eyes (3.10.15); his unfaithful eyes seek a wound (2.22*a*.7). There is also a link to 4.9.53–60 (sight of the female endangers). In *meruere* the narrator abandons self-justification outside the action no less than within it (contrast *caeco* at 47).

67 nostris . . . plagis 'hitting me'. For the poss. pron. cf. 1.8.1 *mea cura* (i.e. for me), Man. 5.561 *tua . . . spectacula*, K–S 1 599, H–S 66; Sen. Rh. *Con.* 2.7.4 *in plagas deterrimi Mancipi uix imbecillitatem muliebris manus continuit*. That passage brings out by contrast C.'s masculinity. She turns even now to another victim: her characteristic indomitability, seen too in her *running* back (63), finds a more virile sphere than sex or partying (2.15.7–8, 2.33*b*.25–6).

68 plutei: apparently the raised parts of the couch (cf. 35–6), including two *fulcra* – curved rests, often elaborately decorated. See couches from Amiterno in Chieti and in Rome (Conserv. inv. 1074), late 1st cent. BC to early 1st AD: L. Pirzio Biroli Stefanelli, *Il bronzo dei Romani* (Rome 1990) 262–3; cf. C. L. Ransom, *Couches and beds of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans* (Chicago 1905) 32–3, 109, 111. Lygdamus updates Medon, the herald (cf. P. 3.6), who hides beneath a chair at Hom. *Od.* 22.362–3. Unlike Medon and the poet Phemius, neither of this pair is spared – at present.

69 eruitur 'is pulled out, unearthed' (cf. *OLD* s.v. 1*a*). Enjambement mimics the sudden act. Lygdamus thus accidentally (so Rothstein) assumes the pose of entreating the *genius* of the *paterfamilias*: a guardian spirit, partly identified with the person (Apul. *Socr.* 151–2 etc.). It is at the centre of household cult, and commonly

shown on household shrines (G. K. Boyce, *Corpus of the lararia of Pompeii* (Rome 1937); J. B. Lott, *The neighborhoods of Augustan Rome* (Cambridge 2004) 111). This comic endorsement of the narrator's status in the house he affects in 70 to take seriously, but only to confirm his powerlessness. In this scene Lygdamus must not really think the narrator powerful.

prostratus (Λ p.o.), if right, is probably conjecture. *prostratus adorat* is familiar in Christian Latin (e.g. August. *CD* 11.33 *si prostratus adoraueris me* (Matt. 4:9; *cadens in Vulg.*)). *protractus* (NTI) is possible, *eruitur* and *protractus* giving two stages; but *prostratus* is funnier.

70 Lydgame: the apostrophe creates a pathetic complicity between the males.

captus makes concrete a word which begins the affair (1.1.1 *Cynthia . . . me cepit ocellis*), and is often looked back to (2.3.9, 30a.9–10, 3.10.15, 25.5 (apparently the end of the affair)).

71–2 The narrator is allowed to make a treaty only when (*tum demum . . . cum*) C. reluctantly grants his supplication by allowing him to touch her feet (for *uix* cf. e.g. Ov. *F.* 3.688 *euicta est: precibus uix dedit illa manus*). Continuing the train of thought in 70, he shows himself having to use supplication, unlike Lygdamus intentionally and to the one with power. Lying at someone's feet in entreaty often fails: e.g. *Ad Her.* 4.33, Cic. *Sest.* 54, *CIL* vi² 41062 II.24–5 (1st cent. BC) [*ad eius*] | *pedes prostrata humi n[on] modo non adleuata sed trá[.]*. C.'s behaviour to the narrator is partly military hostility, partly her established character (3.6.32 *'poena erit ante meos sera sed ampla pedes'*) and partly sexual aversion to his now polluting touch (83–4, 86).

ueni (T^pC): Virg. *Aen.* 4.339 *nec haec in foedera ueni*, Livy 34.57.8.

73–82 The *foedus* between lovers, essential to 4.7, is here made more literal, public and (in appearance) remote from love. Cf. the parodic legal document drawn up by the lover at Plaut. *Asin.* 746–808. Illuminating for the subversion of gender here are the quasi-military terms imposed by the woman (disguised as a man) in Hasse's opera *La Fantesca* (1729), nos. 11–12 (M. P. Jacoboni Neri's edn. (Bologna 2001) 38–45). For Romans, the surrender of the defeated enemy entitles the victor to frame detailed *leges* as a condition for peace (Livy 30.30.24, 34.57.7, cf. Ov. *Met.* 8.101–2; e.g. Livy 30.16.10–12 for detail). Solemn agreement is required from the enemy, and time for reflection is allowed (Livy 30.16.13–15); in 82, however, the narrator decides swiftly on acceptance. C.'s instant oral delivery adds to the incongruity: the terms were normally written, after elaborate consultation.

73 admissae . . . culpa 'the wrong you have committed'. In legal contexts cf. e.g. Ulp. *Dig.* 30.47.2 *et in alieno culpa admitti potest*, Modest. *Dig.* 26.7.32.1.

74 formula 'the exact form of words' (*TLL* s.v. 1117.38–52) is strongly legal.

75 The porticoes of Pompey, a large public garden, were soon known as a place to find women in (Cat. 55.6–12, Ov. *AA* 3.387–8, Mart. 11.47.3–4 etc.).

Cf. G. Sauron in *L'Urbs* (Rome 1987) 457–73; *LTUR* IV 148–9, *MAR* 207. The narrator is forbidden to aim at winning women by his appearance (cf. Ov. *AA* 3.681–2). C. herself had been depicted in 2.32.11–16 as deserting the attractions of the porticoes for Lanuvium and the like.

spatiabere, so apt to the porticoes, is not suitable to watching gladiatorial games in the Forum; for verbs less suited to one in a pair cf. H–S II 565–6. *et cum . . . Forum*, | *colla* (Lipsius) mixes theatre and amphitheatre; it would be better to suppose that say *spectabere* (cf. e.g. 3.21.3, Ov. *Her.* 21.103) had been corrupted under the influence of Ov. *AA* 1.67 *Pompeia lentus spatiare sub umbra*.

76–7 The Forum was still being strewn with sand and used for gladiatorial games: Ov. *AA* 1.164 (with Hollis ad loc.), *F.* 3.813, *LTUR* II 331–2, 338, *MAR* 130.

At the theatre (77) women were now seated in a separate, high row. This decorous arrangement, perhaps reinforced by a *Lex Iulia theatralis* (26 BC?), is thwarted in 2.22a.4–10: there the narrator ogles the gallery of women. Here C. catches up with him. Cf. E. Rawson, *Roman culture and society* (Oxford 1991) 508–45. At the Circus and amphitheatre (76), women were still mixed with men (Ov. *AA* 1.163–70, cf. P. 2.19.9): an arrangement yet more pleasing to the susceptible (cf. *lascivium*). Augustus later caught up with them (Suet. *Aug.* 44.2; cf. for the sequence of legislation Dio 53.25.1, 55.22.4).

caue + subj. 2.13.41.

78 lectica: the curtained litter (*RE* XII 1056–108) favoured female modesty, but allowed for dramatic revelations of beauty (cf. Ov. *Rem.* 663–8), such as to fascinate the gazer (cf. 77). *se det* (Gruter) thus fits more neatly than *nudet aperta* (Koch; 5).

tuae . . . morae ‘you dallying’, cf. 4.7.69–70n.

79–80 The final and most important instruction (*imprimis*) matches the *Lygdamus uratur* which opens the section on the narrator’s house at 4.7.35. This placing underlines the significance of the narrator’s ensuing disobedience.

| **Lygdamus . . . | ueneat** takes up 68–9 | *Lygdamus . . . | eruitur*. The verb is more at home in legal discourse than dignified poetry: so Ulp. *Dig.* 10.2.18.2 (slave).

omnis mihi causa querelae: the *quer-* stem suits C. (cf. 4.7.95n.: another ending). But it is apparent that the narrator is hiding a more complicated plot for 4.8 as well as 4.7. The phrase first admits emotion to the cold control of C.’s speech (73–80).

bina: here both feet are to be shackled, for cruelty; cf. Ov. *F.* 1.370 *geminas . . . manus*, for security. This punishment, for which cf. e.g. Macer *Dig.* 48.19.10 *pr.*, cannot be dictated to the new master: it must precede *ueneat* in time. See 4.7.11–12n.

81 indixit shows imposition; so of a *iudex* at *RS* 1.61 (2nd cent. BC). Cf. Livy 21.41.9 *grauas impositas uictis . . . leges fremens maerensque accepit*. The dignity of *legibus utar* ‘I will live by these laws’ (cf. *RS* 19 I 8–10 (68 BC?)) is merely formal.

leges (T): the pl. *legibus* is not merely equivalent to a sing. in meaning; *legem* (Ω) . . . *legibus* would thus produce an unwelcome shift.

82 riserat: the plup. is often used instead of perf. (aorist) or impf.; cf. e.g. 1.15.10, 19.10, 3.8.1. The laughter implies superiority: cf. e.g. *Ov. Met.* 2.704, *F.* 4.5 (gods).

imperio . . . rato (Heinsius): his acceptance has made her 'command' binding. *imperium* 'power' is given (*dato*) by the more powerful: people or exceptionally senate (*Cic. Phil.* 11.20, *Aug. RG* 1.2). And 71–81 imply power given already.

facta superba: the narrator claims to know her mind. He is causing her *superbia*, as at 2.1.8 – and 3.24.2 *olim oculis nimium facta superba meis*: the reversal there is now reversed.

83–6 The purification recasts that in *Hom. Od.* 22.481–2, 490–4. The cause is killing there, here the polluting presence of unchaste women (cf. e.g. *Sen. Rh. Con.* 1.2.10 *conseruarum* (prostitutes) *osculis inquinatur*). There all the house and courtyard are fumigated. Here purification is confined to specific places and to the man, touched thrice (cf. 4.6.6n.). It thus has a more ritualistic quality. Cf. Wissowa (1912) 390 on *lustratio*.

83 externae: outside the relationship (1.3.44 *externo . . . amore* etc.); but also alien to the house (cf. *Sen. Ag.* 915).

84 suffiit 'fumigated' with sulphur (86). The burning of pungent substances (cf. R. C. T. Parker, *Miasma* (Oxford 1983) 227–8), and the use of water, bring purity. Cf. *Ov. F.* 4.733–4, 736, 739–40 (*Parilia*). The threshold is crucial in love's topography; cf. P. Pucci, *Glyph* 3 (1978) 52–73; DeBrohun (2003) 127–34.

85 is difficult. More apt than cloaks (*lacernas* Π (*lac/lat*); cf. Heyworth) are lamps, the witnesses of love-making (cf. e.g. 2.15.3, *Ar. Eccl.* 7–11, *Mart.* 11.104.5–6). Here the lamps are the pottery or metal objects, at this period decorated and often elaborate (D. M. Bailey, *A catalogue of the lamps in the British Museum* (Oxford 1975–88) II 126–8; Pirzio Biroli Stefanelli (68–9n.) 182–207, 268–76). Changing all the oil in the lamps (Goold) would be too trivial. Nor does 87 sufficiently defend this use of *mutare. iterum* 'a second time' is not justified by 43; *iterum mutare* could not convey reversion to an original state (*OLD* s.v. *iterum* 1c). Perhaps *mutato* (87) and *toto* (88) have affected 85, as *respondi* (81) has affected 87. Say *extinctas* (she gave orders to put them out again (reversion), and replace them)?

86 An unpleasant experience, like that of the sheep touched *fumanti sulphure* at *Ov. F.* 4.739–40. *caput* again takes up 1.1.4 *caput impositis pressit Amor pedibus*, cf. 2.30a.7–8, 3.10.18 (contrast 16). It embodies the idea of control over the narrator.

87–8 The poem ends with an embrace like 4.7; but the embrace is satisfying. We return to closes in earlier books: love-making ends 2.33a (*ter* 22 is energetic like *toto*) and 3.10 (*solumus . . . sollemnia* 31 is echoed in *solumus*). Although in the *Odyssey* fighting is followed by love (*Od.* 23.295–6), here, where enemies become lovers, martial literature surrenders to amatory. Cf. *Ov. AA* 2.459–66 (warlike discord and language defeated). Tarpeia's fanciful claim *acies . . . soluere* by her marriage-bed (4.4.59–62) is in 4.8 made real.

mutato . . . lecto: not an everyday expression like 'change the bed', but a complication of *palliis lecti mutatis omnibus* (cf. *OLD* s.v. *muto* 4a; for *per singula pallia*, change extending to each, cf. *TLL* s.v. *per* 1163.6–21, 1164.40–54, *al.*).

†**respondit**† (cf. 81) need not resemble what it has replaced. Nothing convinces.

toto: cf. [Quint.] *Decl. Mai.* 5.15 *per totum cubile corpus . . . exagitare* (sickness), *Anth. Lat.* 427.11–12 Shackleton Bailey (love-making).

4.9: HERCULES

4.9 emerges at its close as the first poem in book 4 to adopt the 'classic' type of *aition* which seem to have dominated in books 1 and 2 of the *Aetia*: a solution to the cultic problem of why women are excluded from feasts at the Ara Maxima (Plut. *QR* 60). Like Callimachus, P. will be transforming prose; this may well be Varro. Cf. Macr. *Sat.* 1.12.28 (which follows Varro *Div.* fr. 218 Cardauns . . . *nec uir templum eius [Bona Dea] ingreditur*); *unde et mulieres in Italia sacro Herculis non licet interesse, quod Herculi cum boues Geryonis per agros Italiae duceret sitienti respondit mulier aquam se non posse praestare, quod Feminarum Deae celebraretur dies, nec ex eo apparatu uiris gustare fas esset. propter quod Hercules facturus sacrum delestatus est praesentiam feminarum, et Potitio ac Pinario sacrorum custodibus iussit ne mulierem interesse permitterent* (Macrobius' rhythmic prose). If Varro told the tale, it was appended to his prime concern here, the Bona Dea. P. would be inverting this arrangement. The rites of the Bona Dea are set into a story about Hercules (H.); nothing is said about the goddess, and her rites are not explained (contrast Butas *SH* 235). The structure subordinates females to males.

P. inserts his story from prose into one told particularly in a chief poetic intertext of book 4, *Aeneid* 8 (184–305). H.'s thirst now separates the Ara Maxima from its *aition*, the killing of Cacus; the eventual aetiology (67–70, cf. Virg. *Aen.* 8.268–72) becomes more 'classic', in the sense above, and another *aition* is added (19–20). A structure is generated in which a first story (on Cacus) can be set against a second, and in which a long, demeaning speech (33–50) can be framed by more dignified, and Virgilian, speeches (16–20, 67–70).

The poem takes up in H. a central figure of Greek literature and art. Major intertexts are: from elegy, Call. fr. 9.19–21, 24–7 Massimilla, early in *Aetia* 1 (Heracles' and his son's hunger; his violence to two bulls, despite the owners); from epic, A.R. 4.1393–482 (the Argonauts' thirst; Heracles' thirst and violence in the garden of the Hesperides). Large aspects of Greek tradition feed into the thematic concerns of book 4: Heracles' problematic status between god and mortal, relations between females and this extreme of virility. But like Virgil P. is also capturing a distinctive character and distinctive narrative moves. The imperious desire, and the explosion of violence (not in Macrobius), suit Heracleian narrative and the sequence of book 4. H.'s image in the poem can be seen as selected from a wide range of options in the tradition: altruistic aid to mankind

is not in the foreground, but he is obeying a basic need rather than getting drunk (cf. e.g. *LIMC* IV 770–2, v 158–60). He might also seem highly sacrilegious.

Roman, not just Augustan, cult and politics add to the mix. The Ara Maxima was a central object in Roman life (D.H. *Ant.* 1.40.6); the Bona Dea mattered before Livia, as is brought out by glances here at Clodius' scandalous intrusion in disguise (26n.). P. partly exploits, partly cloaks (69n.), the striking differences of the two sets of rites: those of the Bona Dea enclosed (as by the structure of the poem), strictly secret, and enacted by a limited number of women; those of the Ara Maxima involving public male feasting, in the open, on a large scale. As for Augustus and his family, the temple of the Bona Dea on the Aventine was at some point restored by Livia (Ov. *F.* 5.148–58; cf. Brouwer (1989) 68–9 for related female action). The first of Octavian's triumphs in August 29 took place at the same time as an annual feast of H. (the Ara Maxima was only used, if it was used, on the day before: cf. *II* XIII 1.344, 570, 2.180, 190, 493–6). P. underlines the link of Actium with H.'s deeds at the start (3n.). After 29, Augustus paid little practical attention to H. or the altar. He linked himself to H. less than to Apollo, the subject of 4.6 (cf. the plaques mentioned in 4.6 intro.). The poets, who expand the connection, can treat H. more freely, and contrast him with Augustus too.

The narrative poem 1.20 had much reduced the characterization of H. from P.'s Hellenistic models. Now he bursts into the Propertian corpus, starting with his large patronymic. Pointers to books 1–3 both make H. comic, and mark poetic difference (1–6, 15nn. etc.). H. contributes vitally to the thematic dialectic of book 4. He is a dynamic, but complicated, figure: no other character in book 4 has more than one speech in a poem, and the changes in and between his speeches create a complex pattern. The narrator of 5, 7 and 8 had formed an anomalously weak male in a book populated predominantly by male gods and generals and enamoured women. In 7 and especially 8 he had drastically displayed the male subjection characteristic of books 1 to 3. H., vigorous male and future god, shows in his central speech an unexpected proximity to the prostrated narrator of love-elegy. At its end clothes, and rhetorical need, make his social feminization shamefully extreme. But we should not allow excitement at H.'s bra (49) to obscure the structure and dynamic of the poem. The male overcomes the female no less decisively than the female the male in 4.8. This victory of the male continues into 4.10.

As significant as gender is deity. H.'s passage to godhead is less smooth than Augustus', his metamorphoses less fluent than Vertumnus'. The narrator's perspective both superimposes and contrasts the times before and after apotheosis: cf. *deo* 13, 32; Juno at 43, 75. H.'s own consciousness is different. He mostly speaks, and is treated by the other speaker, as a mortal male. In other accounts (Livy 1.7.10, Strab. 5.3.3, Solin. 1.10, cf. Ov. *F.* 1.583–4), he learns directly after killing Cacus that he will become a god; here he more opaquely shows, at the end (66–70), a sense of his own imminent divine status (cf. 19–20n.). Present divine status cuts the narrative knot: perilous sacrilege by a mortal turns into the act of a god. Human need takes him into, and out of, ungodlike subservience. Female

and religious prohibition impel him, through anger, into virility and conscious divinity. The poem concerns inclusion in and exclusion from categories as well as places.

Some discussions: W. S. Anderson, *AJP* 85 (1964) 1–12; Pillinger (1969) 182–9; E. McParland, *TAPA* 101 (1970) 349–55; P. Pinotti, *GIF* 8 (1977) 50–71; E. Coli, *GIF* 9 (1978) 298–305; J. F. Miller, *ANRW* II 30.1.386–9; J. Warden, *Hermes* 110 (1982) 228–42; F. Cairns in K. Galinsky (ed.), *The interpretation of Roman poetry* (Frankfurt 1992) 65–95; Fox (1996) 169–75 and *MD* 43 (1999) 157–76; F.-H. Mutschler in R. Faber and B. Seidensticker (edd.), *Worte, Bilder, Töne* (Würzburg 1996) 115–28; S. Lindheim, *AJP* 119 (1998) 43–66; Janan (2001) ch. 8 (cf. ead., *Helios* 25 (1998) 65–77); Rambaux (2001) 304–6; D. Spencer, *Arethusa* 34 (2001) 259–84; B. Effe, *Hermes* 130 (2002) 164–75; DeBrohun (2003) 118–43, 157–65, 175–84, 201–7; K. Welch, *AJP* 125 (2004) 61–90. For H., see Wissowa (1912) 271–84; *RE* VIII 1.550–611; J. Bayet, *Les origines de l'Hercule romain* (Paris 1926); Latte (1960) 213–21; G. K. Galinsky, *The Herakles theme* (Oxford 1972); E. Simon, *Die Götter der Römer* (Darmstadt 1990) 72–87; *LLMC* IV 1.728–838, V 1.1–262; Ritter (1995); C. Jourdain-Annequin and C. Bonnet (edd.), *Héraclès II. Les femmes et le féminin* (Brussels 1996); U. Huttner, *Chiron* 27 (1997) 369–91. Bona Dea: Brouwer (1989); G. Herbert-Brown, *Ovid and the Fasti* (Oxford 1994) 131–45; A. Staples, *From Good Goddess to virgins* (London 1998) ch. 1.

1–6 A long sentence (for elegy) expresses H.'s vast journey, and begins the narrative with pomp. Important for this passage are Hor. C. 3.14.1–4, where Augustus' return from Spain is likened to H.'s (3n.), and P. 3.22.9. There Tullus is asked to come back to Rome from *Geryonis stabula* (and other mythological extremities). The link marks P.'s more public and less personal viewpoint now.

H.'s return with the cattle taken from Geryon on the island Erytheia (more or less Gades) had been used to get him to numerous locations besides Rome (Lightfoot on Parth. EP 30).

1 Amphitryoniades: the resounding patronymic, filling the whole first half of the line, had been unusual in Latin poetry hitherto (only at Cat. 68b.112, Virg. *Aen.* 8.103, 214). P. is gesturing to Virgil, but also emphasizing the connection with Greek poetry, where Ἀμφιτρωνιάδης is common (e.g. Hes. *Theog.* 317, Bacch. 5.85, Theocr. 13.55). H. will end the poem as the Italic Sancus (72).

tempestate 'time'. This use is thought archaic and poetic by Cicero (*De Orat.* 3.153; cf. *ILLRP* 514.5 (2nd cent. BC)); it appears in Livy (e.g. 26.35.2), and at Cat. 64.73, 66.11, but is rare in Augustan poetry (Ov. *Met.* 1.183, Jupiter in council). The line strains again for unusual grandeur.

20 is uncommon with place-names (rivers Stat. *Theb.* 7.283–4), and grandiose.

3 inuictos, pecorosa Palatia, montes: the 'inserted apposition' (see J. B. Solodow, *HSCP* 90 (1986) 129–53) enables the forceful juxtaposition of the pre-urban site with the victorious Augustus and Apollo (cf. 4.6). *inuictos*, if correct,

shows the two as matching *Hercules Inuictus*: the cult in the area of the Ara Maxima (cf. *II* XIII 2.180, 190). The opposition of times in 4.1.3–4 (Evander's cattle and Palatine Apollo) is somewhat diminished here. Even if *inuictus* is incorrect, mention of the Palatine is significant; 4.9 never names the Aventine, home of Cacus in Virgil and of the Bona Dea. *pecorosa* glances at etymologies of *Palatium* from *balare* 'bleat' etc. (Maltby (1991), s.v.). For the pl. cf. Man. 4.28 *Capitolinos* . . . *montes*.

4 fessus: H.'s temporary tiredness enables the theft in Livy 1.7.4–5 (*et ipsum fessum*), D.H. *Ant.* 1.39.2; for *fessos fessus* cf. Wills (1996) 226–8. P.'s extension of the motif (34; 66?) fits e.g. the Farnese type H. (*LIMC* IV 1.762–5; S. Kansteiner, *Herakles* (Cologne 2000) 99–105, 108–9); contrast Ov. *Met.* 9.198–9. A link is made with Aeneas and his men (Virg. *Aen.* 3.85, 7.126 etc.).

5–6 The Velabrum, beneath the Palatine, was in P.'s day a commercial area; it had once supposedly been covered by water. Cf. *LTUR* V 101–8, *MAR* 253–4. 5 takes up 4.2.7–10 (cf. *suo* . . . *flumine* with the role of the Tiber there); 6 looks to Tib. 2.5.33–6 (rustics' boats on the Velabrum). *nauta per urbanas* paradoxically conflates the stages separated in 4.2. (*quoque* (5) would make the waters the Tiber, and remove the paradox.) A *nauta* need not be marine (4.7.92 etc.), but the word and the sails whimsically suggest a parochial voyage to be set against H.'s vast journeys. (3.22.7–16, like *Aetia* 1, collocate H. and the Argonauts.) *uelificabat* etymologizes (see Maltby (1991) on Tib. l.c.); the unelevated word adds to the complication of effect, as at 2.28.39–40 (Charon).

7–10 do not seem to cohere. Cacus entertains H. in his home (7–8), but this cannot be the fearsome cave of 9–10 (cf. *ab*), though that is his home (as *ab* again implies). 7–8 require that Cacus should be a host, not just part of the receiving land. Butler and Barber on 9–10 see and evade the difficulty. *incola Cacus erat* could be thought laborious and flat after 7. One could delete 7–8, or 8–9 (10 then connotes treachery, cf. *bilinguis*); but *furto polluit ille Iouem* looks like P. If 9–12 are spurious (suspected by Hutchinson), they expand after Livy, Virgil etc., and spell out *tria* 15; cf. Ov. *Met.* 9.[196a] for an interest in Cacus. Without 9–12, *furtum* would be forcefully repeated (13), and taken up in *furis* (14).

Cass. Hem. fr. 5 Chassignet seems to show the story of Cacus going back to the second century BC. Cf. J. P. Small, *Cacus and Marsyas* (Princeton 1982), *LIMC* III 1.177–8.

7 hospite: 'Cacios' is host in another version, Diod. 4.21.2. P. morally reverses H.'s own inhospitable unconcern towards the gods (and horse-stealing), Hom. *Od.* 21.22–30.

8 Iouem: i.e. *Iuppiter hospitalis*. Cf. e.g. Cic. *Deiot.* 18; Val. Max. 9.2 *ext.* 3: the *hospitales deos* of Asia spattered with blood. For *fides* as a central theme of book 4 see Intro. section 4, 4.1.79–80n.

10 per tria partitos . . . ora 'divided between three mouths'. See 15n.

11 manifestae: as a result of *certa forent*. The near synonyms come less stylishly in Luck's *manifestaque* (*RhM* 105 (1962) 349).

12 This unnaturalistic method is fixed even in the historians (Livy 1.7.5, D.H. *Ant.* 1.39.2). Similar language is used at Livy, l.c., *auersas* ('backwards': the source of *auersos* here?) . . . *caudis in speluncam traxit*; Virg. *Aen.* 8.210 *cauda in speluncam tractos*, Ov. *F.* 1.550.

13 *furtum* (Heyworth (1986) 210–11) deals with two problems. (i) *furem sonuere* requires an abnormal use of the verb: the apparent parallel Mart. 2.72.5 *6 auctorem criminis . . . Caecilium . . . rumor . . . sonat* gives a reported statement (so too Hor. *Epist.* 1.16.36 *si clamet furem*). (ii) (a) H., the only god in question, did not witness the dragging of the cattle, and (b) it would be strange to make someone a *witness* to a theft from themselves. (ii) (a) would be alleviated if 9–12 were removed: Jupiter (8) could then notice and cause the mooing. *furtum* does not deal alone with (ii) (b); and being a witness to the fact that the theft has occurred is in the context a strained use of *testis dei* (Hutchinson) *furtum* would mean an impious 'theft from the god' (Sen. *Med.* 821–2 *caeli . . . furta*); cf. [Quint.] *Decl. Min.* 265.6 *furtum sine teste facere*. To make the stolen property witnesses is strange, but clever: cf. Ov. *F.* 1.560 *mugitum . . . furta dedere*.

14 Heroic and narrative speed go together (*et* assists). Contrast Virg. *Aen.* 8.228–46 (H. strives to enter). The breaking of the doors connects with 61–2, 4.8.51 (Cynthia catches the faithless and secretive narrator); all these places contrast with the lover's defeat by the mistress's 'cruel' door (2.5.22 *nec . . . fregerit ira fores*; *crudelis* etc. 1.16.17, Ov. *Am.* 1.4.62, *AA* 3.581). *implacidas* also befits the heads on Cacus' doors (Virg. *Aen.* 8.196–7).

diruo is more commonly used of buildings (*OLD* s.v. 2): this is a mighty deed.

15 **Maenali** 'Arcadian'; on H. and Arcadia see M. Jost in C. Bonnet and C. Jourdain-Annequin (edd.) *Héraclès* (Brussels 1992) 245–61. Other origins for the club: e.g. Apollod. 2.4.11, Paus. 2.31.10. P. has chosen this one partly to connect with 1.1.13 14 (for love, Milanion) *Hylaei percussus uulnere rami* | *saucius Arcadiis rupibus ingemuit*; the link brings out the change of perspective from love-elegy. Pastoral comes in too (16n.): Arcadia, home of Pan's song, forms the climax of the *Eclogues* (cf. R. H. A. Jenkyns, *Virgil's Experience* (Oxford 1998) 157–69); cf. *Ecl.* 8.42 *Maenalius . . . uersus*. See also 22n.

pulsus: the crucial Herculean action in the story as such is subordinated.

tria tempora 'in his three temples'; acc. of part of body (cf. H–S 36–8). The extreme of monstrosity is chosen. If Cass. Hem. fr. 5 Chassignet makes Cacus' conqueror Tricaranus ('Threeheads': *Recaranus* codd.), and so rationalizes the three-headed H. who *may* be shown on stele Mus. Naz. Garganico inv. 0810 (7th cent. BC), then some version had transferred the three heads to Cacus. Cf. G. Puccioni in *Mythos* (Genoa 1970) 235–9, M. L. Nava, *Stele daunie* 1 (Florence 1980) 141 and pl. CXC VII. Geryon (1–6n.) is *τρικέφαλον* 'three-headed' at Hes. *Theog.* 287, and commonly in Etruscan and Italic art.

16 **Alcides** is adopted by Augustan poets from Hellenistic (Call. *Hy.* 3.145 etc.).

ite boues (with anaphora) evokes pastoral closure: Virg. *Ecl.* 1.74 *ite meae* . . . , *ite capellae*, 10.77 *ite domum* . . . , *ite capellae*. The fusion of urban and rural in this speech is underlined. 2.34.67–76 contrast modern Rome with pastoral; cf. 3.13.25–46 (39–46 Arcadia), 4.4.5–6 (pastoral in early Rome).

17 Herculis: the proud use of his own name mingles the heroic with the pastoral. For such use cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 10.830, 11.689 (Aeneas, Camilla); P. 4.11.43 (Cornelia).

labor ultime clauae: both as canonical labour (Geryon) and as ‘additional’ labour (Cacus). P. visibly selects: Geryon is here, unusually, the last canonical labour (cf. Cic. *Dom.* 134, Ov. *F.* 1.583–4); elsewhere various weapons are used against him (Stes. S15 col. ii, cf. S16?; *LIMC* v 1.74–9). At Virg. *Aen.* 8.259–61 (not in Livy or Dionysius) H. throttles Cacus. Neatly, another deed awaits, but not for his club (*umeris* 61).

18 bis . . . bis: the anaphora expresses both pride and weariness. The elegant conjunction of tasks (Geryon and Cacus) slightly taints the morality: cf. Livy 1.7.5 *praedam* (Cacus’).

quaesitae: for the joined tasks, P. reverts to Greek tradition; here Geryon’s cattle are always fem. (Stes. S11.27, Parth. EP 30.1 etc.). So Ovid moves from *Erytheidas* to include *tauros* (*F.* 1.543–8; mixed in Virgil, fem. in Dionysius and so probably Livy).

19–20 seem to offer the closure of an *aition* – but a surprising one: not the Ara Maxima, but the Forum Boarium. This is elsewhere explained by the sale of cattle (Varro *LL* 5.146; cf. Livy 21.62.3) or the statue of a bull (Ov. *F.* 6.478). On it cf. *CIL* vi 1035.6 (‘Arch’ of Argentarii, AD 203–4) and see F. Coarelli, *Il foro boario* (Rome 1988), *LTUR* II 295–7, *MAR* 131–3. P. sharpens Virg. *Aen.* 8.360–1 *passimque armenta uidebant | Romanoque foro et lautis mugire Carinis: nobile . . . Romae . . . forum* is not the Forum Romanum but a less obvious and apter place. *Romae* is, unlike *Romanoque*, voiced by a character in the narrative, and without the aid of prophecy (Livy 1.7.10 etc.). Perhaps H.’s divine status is suggested by his knowledge.

sancite ‘legally confirm’ as bovine, cf. *OLD* s.v. 1b. *mugitu* adjoins and clashes.

erit: forum is in sense the predicate. See 4.1.14n.

21 An abrupt transition, via the mouth, from the dignified speech.

torquet ‘tortures’, perhaps also ‘twists’ (Housman 341). *torret* (ς) would suit the throat more (Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.114 *fauces urit sitis*, Ov. *Met.* 11.129 30, Nic. *Ther.* 350).

22 points to Call. *Hy.* 1.15–32: Rhea bids the Earth ‘give birth to’ (29) water in a still riverless Arcadia (cf. 15n.). Ignoring the water of 5–6 and 4.4.3–6, P. momentarily transforms Rome, not into the pastoral Arcadia of *Eclogue* 10 (cf. 4.8.48n.), but into a still earlier land. 4.8.1 contrasts (the artificially *aquosus* Esquiline). Evander and *Aeneid* 8 add to the significance of Arcadia in the poem.

23 The laughter of women among themselves conjures up for the reader a separate female world. It resembles the cries of the girls at play which awake Odysseus after his toils at sea (Hom. *Od.* 6.115–26, cf. 33, 45–6nn.). For female

laughter and its (ideally) distinctive character cf. Ov. *AA* 3.281–90, with Gibson's nn. It is rare in P. and must recall here, pointedly, victorious Cynthia's laughter near the end of 4.8 (82).

inclusas . . . puellas points to P's previous material: 3.3.49 *ut per te clausas sciat excantare puellas* (wives), cf. 3.13.9–10, 14.23–4, Call. fr. 401.1 Pfeiffer ἡ παῖς ἡ κατὰκλειτος 'the enclosed girl'. The narrative presupposes the wall probably frequent for sacred groves and normal for sanctuaries of the Bona Dea. Cf. *ILS* 5429, 5430 (1st cent. BC) . . . *circ(a) lucum macer(iam) et murum et ianu(am)* . . . ; Brouwer (1989) 94–5, 408–9, 423, 425–7 (Augustan complex at Ostia, including well). For a grove to the goddess see 56n.

24 saepserat (Fontein) better suits the series of objects in 25–6, which it is difficult to put in apposition to *nemus*; cf. Heyworth. *nemus* denotes much the same as *lucus* (4.4.49–50n.). Fontein's *murus* would demand his *umbrosum* too.

25–6 Religious exclusion now enters strongly: nouns of different kinds build up a formidable series. *loca* should not be taken in apposition to *nemus*: the grove is the least sacred part of the sanctuary (56n.), and the apposition across the couplet is awkward. *Femineae* and *uiris* frame the couplet. *impune* . . . *nullis* alludes particularly to Clodius, who violated the rites of the Bona Dea and was killed before a shrine of hers (Cic. *Mil.* 86). *piandos*, 'to be honoured, kept pure' (4.1.50, 7.34nn.), also suggests expiation by punishment: cf. Cic. *Mil.* 73 (of Clodius) *eum cuius supplicio senatus sollemnes religiones expiandas saepe censuit*. The following description teases the reader, if male.

Femineae . . . Deae translates the Greek name for her, ἡ γυναικεία θεός (Varro *Div.* fr. 218 Cardauns, Plut. *Caes.* 9.4 etc.). The elegist indicates a not merely Roman perspective.

27–30 do not form a scene perceived by H.: the door is closed and he has not yet arrived. Rather, they make an ekphrasis for the reader; cf. *huc* 31. This balances the purely natural scene at 4.4.3–6 (cf. there *natiuis* and *ramosa domus*); here a human element complicates. The hut replaces the temple which is now on the Aventine (Ov. *F.* 5.149–58; Bouwer (1989) 400–2; *LTUR* 1 200–1, *MAR* 68–9; cf. *casa* 56 and 4.1.5–6). This primitive object modifies the lyricism. Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 8.347–8 (bushes not temples), 455–6 (birdsong; a lowly house). But there are also links with modern ritual: cf. and contrast 27–8 with 4.6.5–6 (see ad loc.). In an ingenious twist, the decadent decay repaired by Livia is already anticipated. Connected too is the grove that appears at A.R. 4.1422–30, with the Hesperides themselves as trees; but those females are helping the thirsty Argonauts.

27 deuia: cf. *auia* 60; the remoteness suits the privacy. For the festival, *uittae* adorn the *limen* of the temple, not the wall (4.6.6n., Stat. *Silv.* 4.8.1 *uittataque templa*).

28 putris: used of rotting wood as well as crumbling stone; cf. e.g. 2.25.7 (ship).

luxerat is equivalent to *lucibat*: cf. 4.8.81–2n.

29 populus: the poplar was well-known for growing by water (Theophr. *HP* 4.13.2, cf. e.g. Nicias *AP* 9.315 (*HE* 2771–4; by a spring)). It was also, ironically,

sacred to H. (Virg. *Aen.* 8.276–7). The tree underlines a contrast with Apollonius' more accommodating grove, 4.1426 (27–30n.): there the first Nymph becomes a poplar.

longis: the leaves of the *populus nigra* are deltoid, those of the *populus alba* longer. But P. is probably rendering Gk. τανύφυλλος/τανίφυλλος: lit. 'long-leaved', in practice far more loosely used (Bacch. 11.55–6, Nic. *Ther.* 610 etc.). One should in any case hesitate to introduce the loaned *glaucus* (-is Housman), absent from Catullus and from Augustan poetry save Virgil (*Georgics*, *Aeneid*) and the *Ciris*.

31 ruit: the Argonauts, no more dignified, 'rush like mad dogs' (A.R. 4.1393–4) in their search for water.

barbam displays H.'s inconvenient masculinity; cf. e.g. Ov. *Met.* 13.850 (Cyclops) *barba uiros* (sc. *decet*), Mart. 12.42.1–2. Dust in the beard is even more unkempt than in the hair, and does not suggest mourning. *congesta* 'heaped up' is too extreme, even if the act were deliberate (contrast Luc. 9.487 *congestu pulueris* of a sandstorm). *concreta* (considered by Heyworth) would better suit blood; for *collecta* (*cont-*) (Hutchinson) cf. Hor. *C.* 1.1.3–4 *puluerem* . . . *collegisse* 'stir up'.

32 ante fores: an archetypal location for the elegiac narrator (3.7.72, Tib. 1.1.56).

minora deo: beneath his status as a god; cf. Ov. *Met.* 6.368 *uerba minora dea* (Leto begging mortals for a drink), *OLD* s.v. *minor*² 7b. See 4.11.6on.

33–50 could easily have been given pointed connections with the *paraclausithyron* (N–R intro. to Hor. *C.* 3.10, with lit.). More salient links are with speeches in epic and elegy where desperate heroes beg for aid: (i) Hom. *Od.* 6.149–85 (Odysseus and Nausicaa), (ii) Call. fr. 26.8 (or 9) –12 Massimilla (Heracles and Theiodamas), (iii) A.R. 4.1411–21; cf. also (iv) Ov. *Met.* 6.349–59 (Leto and Lycians). The skill of (i) is analysed in the scholia; H.'s speech is less effective persuasion than the others, even apart from the unknown prohibition which makes it vain. There is no praise of the addressees, no promise or wish for their future; little attempt to make the speaker's suffering hit home (cf. Sch. Hom. *Od.* 6.170), in particular the torments of thirst (cf. (iii), (iv)). The other speakers say little or nothing of their identity (even in (iii)). In (i) Odysseus intimates his standing, to counteract unfavourable suppositions (cf. Sch. 164); H. proclaims his identity, feeling that it ought to ensure his success. He then undermines his boast; the speech, as a speech, ends lamely. Persuasion, a skill of Cynthia's in 4.7, is not H.'s forte.

33 precor, striking after 32, can be used to gods or humans. It reminds us of Hom. *Od.* 6.149–52, Call. fr. 26.9, A.R. 4.1411–14, where the divinity of the addressee is at least politely suggested; but H. does not take this line. *sacro quae luditis antro* secondarily suggests Nymphs (cf. Ar. *Birds* 1097–8; A.R. 4.1398, 1414). But primarily *antro* is more or less synonymous with *luci* (4.4.3n.). *luditis* also evokes the games of Nausicaa's party, and intrigues P.'s male readers, notionally as ignorant as H. of the mysteries of the Bona Dea.

34 hospita 'hospitable' (predicative); cf. *TLL* s.v. *hospes* 3030.19–40.

uiris: pl. for sing. cf. e.g. 3.7.16 *sanctos . . . uiros*. But the needless noun is an unfortunate choice by H., and the generality of a pl. heightens the unsuitability, cf. 26, 55.

35 highlights the vexing paradox. Cf. 1.9.16 *medio flumine quaeris aquam. erro circum* (cf. *orbe* 24) does not fit with *huc ruit* (31) in the narrative. H.'s frustrated attempts to enter Cacus' cave in Virgil are recalled (*Aen.* 8.228–32). This reading (Burman) is more pointed than *circa arua* (Baehrens) or *circaque sonantia* (Ω); in the latter the functionless *-que* and the nounless *sonantia* call for a substantive instead (cf. Heyworth).

36 'Even a scoop of water with cupped hand will suffice.' Cf. *OLD* s.v. *flumen* 1c, *suscipio* 1a. His request is modest (*Sen. Ep.* 119.3); but he takes very much more. So too Call. fr. 26 Massimilla, cf. Sch. A.R. 1.1212–19a. One may contrast the bibulous god's cup, still used at the Ara Maxima (*Serv. Auct. Aen.* 8.278), and often depicted on altars (*CIL* vi 328, xiv 13, Villa Alb. inv. 916 (P. C. Bol, *Katalog der antiken Bildwerke* 1 (Berlin 1989) 118–20)). (*Solin.* 1.10–11 need not show that H.'s club too was preserved.)

37–8 H. is unsure how much knowledge to assume in these far-flung parts. Dido stresses that the Carthaginians are not so remote as to be ignorant of Aeneas (*Virg. Aen.* 1.565–8). Cf. *Ov. Met.* 15.497–500 (Virbius-Hippolytus in Italy) 'if you have heard about *aliquem Hippolytum*, . . . *ille ego sum*'. At *Eur. Hel.* 453–4 Menelaus, who is being driven off by an old woman (cf. 61 here), is assured that the Trojan war carries little weight in Egypt.

audistisne: for *audio* with acc. of the person heard about see *TLL* s.v. 1274.10–42.

An apt labour is chosen: it affected the universe. *sustulit* contrasts for the reader with the slight act of *succipio*, *tergo* with *palma*: H. has had grander concerns. H. does not normally hold the *earth*. Perhaps, when Atlas takes back the sky, which H. had been holding, H. figuratively takes back his earth; in view of his deed, he is aptly named *Alcides*, here derived from ἄλκις *uir*tus (cf. Shackleton Bailey; Maltby (1991) s.v. *Alcides*).

39 The cautious *audistisne aliquem*? has become a more confident *quis . . . non audit*? The name conveys pride, as in 17, but also suggests the voice of fame. The narrator's time, and literary resonance, add irony: cf. *Virg. G.* 3.4–5 *quis aut Eurysthea durum | aut inlaudati nescit Busiridis aras*? The emphasis on the weapon increases the ill-placed virility of the self-presentation. But some modified magnificence arguably remains.

40 E.g. *Pind. Nem.* 1.62–3, *Varro Div.* fr. 61 Cardauns stress the number of the beasts here summarized. H.'s present helplessness before mere women contrasts; cf. *Soph. Trach.* 1058–63 (*Cic. Tusc.* 2.20), *TrGF* Adesp. F 653.54–7 (a woman, not lions etc., has slain H.).

uastas 'terrible'; cf. *OLD* 3a and e.g. *Sen. Phaed.* 318 *uasti* of the Nemean Lion. *notas* (ς) is not well supported by *Hor. Epist.* 2.1.11: the 'familiar' monsters are there contrasted with the unexpected Envy.

irrita tela: perhaps sc. *fuisse*; this would match *facta* and lead into *luxisse*.

41 homini: H. presents himself as mortal. All mortals reach Hades, but he alone returned (with Cerberus); cf. Virg. *Aen.* 6.125–31. The uniqueness is drastically expressed by making the darkness suddenly shine, in changing to light. For the experience cf. Livy 9.6.5 *velut ab inferis extracti tum primum lucem aspicere uisi sunt*, Sen. *Phaed.* 835–7; for light and underworld darkness boldly conjoined, Soph. *Aj.* 394–5 (point different), P. R. Hardie, *PLILS* 9 (1996) 104.

[42] P. cannot have written 42 both after 41 and after 65. Even after 41, it is probably spurious: 42 has plainly been in the margin (cf. 66), which arouses suspicion; the extra verb ‘learns’ to govern *luxisse* is unstylish (contrast 3.12.24–36); *quod si* (43) does not connect to what precedes as well as it should in P. (at 2.26a.13, the sentence as a whole connects pointedly). But 42 is probably the first location. There would be obvious motives for interpolation in the loss of a genuine pentameter, and the wish to give *luxisse* a verb (*audīt* being thought to govern acc. nouns in both 39 and 40). 65 could readily be seen as devised to give 42 a hexameter and *accipit* a subject when 42 was placed, from the margin, in another speech. It is less likely that *accipit* would just happen to fit after 41. With the light *at* (*noluit* Heyworth) for *et* (N), *terra* in 42 pointedly and hyperbolically contrasts with Hades and plays between ‘world’, ‘earth’ (cf. 22) and ‘land’; it is certainly less pointed in 66 (*uix* now means ‘only with difficulty’). 65 6 (del. Lütjohann) interrupt the *tristia iura*, pronounced in instant wrath (64), and misplace *inquīt* (68). Transposition of 65–6 to precede 43 does not deal with the apt *accipit*, or the now unsuitable *quod si* in 43 (*etsi* Heyworth). The lost pentameter perhaps demanded aid for the son of Jupiter. E.g. *tecta patent* (Weidgen) would make some connection with 65; but *uix* is not the same as ‘not’, and does not fit when the door is simply shut (as, with the transposition, it would be).

me mea fata trahentem in 65, if spurious, may be inspired by *me mea fata* (nom.) *trahebant* (Ov. *Her.* 12.35 etc.).

43–4 The claim is made implausible by Juno’s fertile persecution (cf. e.g. Bacch. 5.89–91, Virg. *Aen.* 8.291–3). That is confirmed by *iam* 71, which contrasts with H.’s earthly life, and by the reminder of Aeneas’ vain rites to placate her (*Aen.* 8.60–1, 84–5). This potent female is feared by H. He grasps that a women’s ritual is happening; his earlier stress on masculinity seems the less promising.

amarae is ‘cruel’ to H., more than generally nasty (cf. *OLD* s.v. 5a).

clausisset appears to precede *faceretis*, which refers to the present; but Juno should be reacting to H.’s present state. P. often uses impf. and plup. subj. interchangeably: cf. 1.17.19–23, 2.13.49–50, 34.11–12, 3.7.43–6; K–S 1.141.

45–6 aliquam (P: the fem. is essential) has the common function of minimizing the condition, cf. e.g. Cic. *De Orat.* 3.136 *plerique . . . sin aliquis excellit unus e multis . . .* It also neatly inverts Hom. *Od.* 6.138–41: all the girls save one flee the wild-looking and lion-like Odysseus. H.’s appearance is of course terrifying; the young Achilles *dares* to touch his lion-skin (Ov. *F.* 5.395–6). *Libyco* points to A.R. 4.1436–40, where Nymphs describe his alarming accoutrements and features. This conditional

confronts a quite different problem from 43, and one that conflicts with the hopeful 44; there is thus some contrast, though less extreme than in the usual prose *quod si . . . sin*. Cf. *at si* and *sin* in a series of parallel conditions at Virg. *G.* 1.430–2, 454–8.

47–50 In a comic climax for the reader, H. himself adduces his double humiliation as ‘female slave’ (P. Oxy. 3700.2 (mime)) of Omphale, queen of Lydia; they swapped clothing (Quint. *Inst.* 3.7.6 etc.). For the reader, 47–8 stress both humiliations; 49–50 pursue more intimately the feminization of H.’s obstinate body. The image of H. as a woman, memorable in art, implies Omphale as a man (Lucian *Hist. Conscr.* 10, Plut. *Comp. Dem. Ant.* 3.4; *LIMC* VII 1.45–53). The hierarchy of gender is inverted, through love (3.11.17–20 etc.). H. omits Omphale; but her clothes and *Lydo* keep her in mind.

47 Sidonia . . . palla: a contemporary luxury garment (2.16.55 etc.; again of H. at Stat. *Theb.* 10.648). The combination with *seruilia* . . . *officia* ‘slaves’ jobs’ (cf. e.g. Sen. *Const.* 15.1) brings out a further paradox in the developed story: finery but servitude. For slavery and wool cf. *SEG* 30.1144 (Gk. epigram under lost picture of the story in house at Assisi, 1st cent. AD?). Phoenicia connects with 4.3.33–4: a woman weaves Tyrian wool as her *pensa* – for her unwarlike soldier.

49–50: *mollis*, *hirsutum* (4.1.61n.), *duris* are full of generic resonance. *apta* ‘furnished with’ (distorting e.g. Tib. 1.9.70 *Tyrio* . . . *apta sinu*; *TLL* s.v. *aptus* 328.49–62) plays on *aptus* ‘suitable’. Contrast 4.2.23 *non dura puella* (a true change), 3.24, Ov. *Her.* 14.56: a girl’s soft hands do not suit weapons.

cepit ‘contained’. Cf. Varro *LL* 5.131 *capitum* (women’s garment) *ab eo quod capit pectus* (binds, holds in). Not breasts but a huge chest presses the band: cf. Arretine clay relief bowl (Augustan) Boston 98.870 (Ritter (1995) pl. 12.4). *cepit* . . . *pectus* also toys with excluded meanings in regard to love for Omphale (‘captured my heart’): cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.2.40, *Rem.* 108; 4.8.69–70n.

fascia: see G. Sette, *L’abbigliamento* (Rome 2000) 63–4.

51 talibus . . . at talibus: the priestess’s controlling authority recalls the Sibyl’s to Palinurus, Virg. *Aen.* 6.372 *talia fatus erat, coepit cum talia uates. alma* too recalls the Sibyl (Virg. *Aen.* 6.74, 117 (Aeneas speaking)); it is rarely used of mortal women. *al-* answers *At-*. The august female – a mere *mulier* in Macrobius – appears H.’s match.

52 The priestess, in fine attire, presents a dignified counterpart to the transvestite H. (cf. Ov. *F.* 4.339 *purpurea canus cum ueste sacerdos*). Carthaginian crimson links with Sidonian purple, hair-band with breast-band: *cepit* is taken up by *uincta* (of a breast-band e.g. Cat. 64.65). *stamine* (‘woven material’, as at Sil. 3.25) links with H.’s weaving. This Italian further infringes the division between simple past and luxurious present (cf. 4.3.51 *Poenis*). The point is underlined by a suggestion of anachronism on the non-existent Carthage (cf. Tib. 2.3.58: Africa, not Tyre, produces the *color puniceus*). *puniceo* takes up and strengthens *puniceae* . . . *uittae* at 27.

53–60 The priestess's speech is kindly (cf. *alma* 51; 53–4, 59); but its warning is dreadful. She thus contrasts both with the kindly and helpful Nausicaa and Hesperides (Hom. *Od.* 6.187–97, A.R. 4.1431) and with the terrifying Doorkeeper and abusive Theiodamas (Ar. *Frogs* 465–78, Call. fr. 26.13–21(2) Massimilla). She also contrasts with the other old woman of the book, the shameless *lena* who once excluded the narrator (5.73–4). It is left unclear on which side of the door she is speaking.

53 *parce oculis* 'spare your eyes' (by not using them): the same double meaning at Tib. 1.2.35, Ov. *Met.* 5.248. *tuta* (54) confirms the priestess's concern. The goddess sent blind those men who saw her rites: Cic. *Har.* 37, Tib. 1.6.24 etc. Clodius, awkwardly, was not sent blind; but H. did not 'spare the eyes' of Clodius' ancestor Appius Caecus, because of the Ara Maxima (Livy 9.29.5–11, D.H. *Ant.* 1.40.5). The god will be punishing, not punished.

hospes could be used even if the priestess has heard of H. (cf. 4.4.55, A.R. 4.89; contrast [Theocr.] 25.3, 62–4); but she gives no sign of being impressed. Nausicaa orders that the 'stranger' (her first word to Odysseus) should as such be given drink (Hom. *Od.* 6.206–9). The relaxed tourism of 4.1.1 (*hospes*) contrasts with this urgent instruction.

54 *cede*, reinforced by *agedum*, pressingly repeats *abscede* (see Wills (1996) 438–43 for the omitted *abs-*). Cf. Plaut. *Aul.* 40 *exi, inquam, age exi*. H. is not implied to be in the grove (cf. Plaut. *Most.* 460); to its door the *limina* probably belong (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.66.2 (camp)).

55 The character's words take up the narrator's (25–6), which add to her authority.

56 'The altar which protects itself [*OLD* s.v. *uindico* 4a] by the seclusion of the hut', i.e. the temple (27–9). The altar, though probably to be imagined just outside the temple, is closely connected to it, and like it particularly barred to men; cf. Juv. 2.87–9. The point of the misunderstood *ILS* 3492 (Brouwer (1989) 99–100, 380–1) is that the removal of the *altar* to elsewhere enables men to tend the goddess's less sacred *grove*. The meaning 'avenge oneself' is secondarily heard in *se . . . uindicat*; similarly with *piatur*, cf. 25–6n. For personified altars cf. Cat. 68b.79 *quam ieiuna pium desideret ara cruorem*.

57–8 Like Tarpeia (4.4.39–42), the Italian priestess possesses erudition, and an elegist's fluency. Here there is ostentatious allusion to a cross between elegy and epic, Callimachus' fifth *Hymn*, and to a warning tale inset even there, and told there by a narrator with a complex relation to the poet. *magno* closely echoes Call. *Hy.* 5.102 μίϰρῶ . . . μεγάλῳ 'at a great price' (see Bulloch ad loc.). The description in 58 plays on Callimachus' teasing mixture of denial and near-spectacle for the reader (23–8, 70–8; *uates* in 57 points to Callimachus too). This ties in with P's own strategies (25–6, 33nn.).

Pallas is another formidable female, and a great patron of H.; she has overcome yet another fierce female, the Gorgon (2.2.7–8), and ruined a man, Tiresias (unwillingly in Callimachus).

59 puellis: not ‘maidens’ (Goold), but women, here strictly including the old priestess herself.

60 ‘Flows as water that is out of the way, with hidden course [*OLD* s.v. *limes* 3b].’ *lympa* and *unda* differ little in meaning. The course of the spring above ground is presumably to be imagined as all within the grove. Against *una* (Ω) really meaning *unis* (with *puellis*), see Housman on Man. 1.226.

61–2 The power of women, here resting partly on religion, is abruptly annulled as physical force takes over. *anus* is set against *ille umeris*. The explosion of wrath, desire and action suits H. In the special intertexts of this poem, H. at Virg. *Aen.* 8.219–21 blazes up in anger and rushes off to act; in A.R. 4.1445–6, after vain searching, he kicks a suitable rock and makes water appear (desire and powerful action); in Call. *Aetia* 1 he slew Theiodamas’ bull, doubtless in wrath (so explicitly Sch. A.R. 1.1212–19a); in fr. 25 Massimilla he is deaf to the peasant’s curses while he eats his bull, as he at first ignores the priestess’s speech here. Cf. also e.g. the eruption of wrath and promised violence at Eur. *HF* 565–73. The language of 62 potently fuses act, anger and thirst.

opacos: from overhanging trees (29).

ianua clausa: the event of 14 is repeated, but now with female enemies. Cynthia’s action (4.8.51–2) is countered. The world of love-elegy is again called to mind and contrasted (14n.). For *ianua* of the door of the grove see 23n.

63–4 After the combination of *iratam* . . . *sitim*, the two impulses are separated. H. first ‘conquers’ his own thirst, on a massive scale. Anger only then demands expression, but instantaneously (*uix siccis* . . . *labris*); its effects endure. Ovid takes Leto’s dignity further: *distulit ira sitim* (*Met.* 6.366; her vengeance prevents its satisfaction).

iam suggests he has indeed drunk the spring dry, like the Persian army at Hdt. 7.21.1 etc. Cf. *TLL* s.v. *exhaurio* 1408.8–18. At Ion fr. 29 Snell Heracles eats firewood, coal, and all. P.’s brevity avoids undignified detail on H. drinking his fill; not so A.R. 4.1447–9.

tristia ‘grim’ cf. e.g. Sen. *Phaed.* 945; also to be heard is ‘austere’ (cf. *ibid.* 413 etc.), from the perspective of the narrator in love-elegy. Augustus’ recent social laws, *grauibus seuerisque* (Flor. 2.34), are perhaps lightly glanced at.

iura answers *lege* (55). H. is now a god who makes laws himself (*OLD* s.v. *pono* 17a), not a *uir* liable to divine penalties. Cynical possibilities on his impunity (53n.) are not pressed. Now that the poem reaches the *aition*, goddess, shrine and celebrants vanish.

[65–6]: see [42]n. For *angulus mundi* cf. Livy 38.59.6, Vell. 2.102.3.

67–8 The anaphora, like the content, returns us to H.’s more seemingly first speech (16–20), but with a rise in elevation. The *Aeneid* is recalled, not as in the first speech the *Eclogues*: the altar *quae maxima semper | dicetur nobis, et erit quae maxima semper* (8.271–2). Virgil’s aetiological narrative is rejoined at its climax – and then turned in 69–70. *maxima* also recalls 4.1.1, and fits in with the greatness of Rome.

P., like Ov. *F.* 1.579–82, conflates what e.g. D.H. *Ant.* 1.39.4, 40.2, 6 keep separate: an altar to *Iuppiter Repertor*, erected by H. himself near the Porta Trigemina, and the Ara Maxima to H., not erected by him (cf. e.g. Livy 1.7.10, Virg. *Aen.* 8.269–72 (probably)); earlier, Jupiter's altar is *Maxima* in Cass. Hem. fr. 5 Chassignet, if Ps.-Aurelius can be trusted). Cf. *LTUR* III 15–17, IV 62. Ovid actually writes *constituitque sibi quae maxima dicitur aram* (*F.* 1.581). In P. the vow implies dedication to Jupiter, though the orders in 69–70 suit his own cult. It is not made unambiguous that he is the builder: it could be made *maxima* through his mighty deeds (D.H. *Ant.* 1.40.6 finds the altar itself disappointing). Nor do 15–32 and 63–4 give him time to build it; it sounds already built (by Evander, we might suppose: a common tradition for the Ara Maxima).

69 haec takes up *quae* (67). *puellis* is pointedly parallel to *puellis* 59; so too the altar had received particular emphasis at 55–6. *nullis . . . pateat* suggests closing. The exclusions are in fact of different kinds: with the Bona Dea, approaching the temple or seeing the rite is dangerous; with H., women are excluded from participation in the rite, and particularly the food. Cf. Cass. Hem. fr. 5 Chassignet, Plut. *QR* 60 (Tert. *Nat.* 2.7.17 for Lanuvium). Such exclusions are not confined to H., in Greece or Rome (see Sokolowski on *LSS* no. 63, Latte (1960) 83); nor did the exclusion extend to all Roman cults of H. (cf. Plut. l.c., C. E. Schultz, *ZPE* 133 (2000) 291–7). In Cass. and Plut. ll.cc., unlike Macrobius (Varro?), women were excluded at the Ara Maxima because Carmenta, Evander's mother, was absent from the original sacrifice, or late (cf. the Pinarii, e.g. Serv. *Aen.* 8.269).

70 †exterminium†: a Biblical word ('destruction'); cf. 4.8.69n. *externi* (Heinsius) is easy; but what is H.'s point? Mistreating strangers is not implied as it would be by *hospitis*.

sitis ends with some bathos, after *Herculis* and *inulta*: not an epic revenge.

71–2 The male narrator jumps to the present and worships the god; contrast 69. The text jumps to the end (essentially) of Virgil's ceremony and episode: '*salve, uera Iouis proles, decus addite diuis, | et nos et tua dexter adi pede sacra secundo*' (*Aen.* 8.301–2). The close is metatextual, too; it links with 4.1.68, where the narrator wants a *dextera . . . auis* for his city-like poem. H. has a home in the book. 71–2 take up hymnic closes at Call. fr. 25.21–2 Massimilla ('Hail, you with the heavy club'), which stay with Heracles' deeds, and fr. 9.13–14 (end of first *aition*), which ask the Graces to give the poet's elegiacs grace. H.'s masculine patronage suits the book's present direction.

sancte pater: the language of Roman prayer; cf. e.g. Livy 2.10.11 *Tiberine pater . . . te, sancte, precor*, *CIL* XIV 3565 refrain (*ML* no. 155). *sanctus* is especially apt for H.: cf. *ILLRP* 149.1 *sancte*, with Ritter (1995) pl. 3.5, *CIL* I² (fasc. 4) p. 922. For *pater* to gods, cf. *OLD* s.v. 6a, Untermann (2000) s.v. *patir*. 73–4 suggest that Sancus was once in the text; *Sance* in 72 would without excessive emphasis mark the Greek hero as now an Italian god, and add Callimachean erudition on titles to the final prayer (cf. Call. *Hy.* 3.259).

Sancus was equated with *Dius Fidius* (*CIL* vi 568 etc.; *Tab. Iguv.* VIIb 5 *fisoui sansi*, Untermann (2000) s.vv. *fiso*, *sansie*; cf. Cato *Orig.* fr. II 21 Chassignet, with Sabine Sancus). Some took *Dius Fidius* – supposedly *Diouis filius* – as H. (so Aelius Stilo fr. 9 Funaioli).

Iuno: the hostile female of 43–4 now accepts the god. The change in Juno which frames the *Aeneid* comes at the end of this poem (1.279–82 (*aspera Iuno . . . fouebit* | *Romanos*), 12.791–842). But P. turns the emphasis to H. and his book.

73–4 (del. L. Richardson, Jr) are a kind of verse scholion; cf. e.g. 3.7.[23–4]; Virg. *Aen.* 6.[242]. They follow the closing prayer clumsily. Transposed before 71–2, they obtrude on the Ara Maxima *aition* with jarring irrelevance, and interrupt a neat transition (71–2n.). 71–4 become chiefly about the name Sancus. *saxxerat* cannot mean ‘ratify, confirm’, as in classical use; it will be suggested by 19 and the later ‘sanctify’ (e.g. Tert. *Res.* 48.11, *Ieiun.* 16.4). *composuere Cures* ‘the town of Cures built’, with the god for the temple (cf. *TLL* s.v. *compono* 2122.75–2123.42), hardly fits the temple on the Quirinal, probably meant here (Ov. *F.* 6.213–18, *LTUR* iv 263–4; cf. Varro *Div.* fr. 219 Cardauns). Ov. *F.* 6.216 *sic uoluere Cures* (on the name) has led astray. *sic* taking up *quoniam* (*OLD* s.v. *sic*) is too prosaic to be plausible in P.

4.10: JUPITER

The subject of 4.10, in a sense, is Jupiter Feretrius. His temple, on top of the Capitol (probably in the Area Capitolina), was supposedly founded by Romulus; it was restored by Augustus (Nep. *Att.* 20.3, Livy 4.20.7, Aug. *RG* 19). It received *spolia opima*, dedicated when the general had slain the enemy general in battle (so 46). The start and close of the poem address directly the origin of *Feretrius*; the rest recounts the three times these *spolia* were won: when Romulus, A. Cornelius Cossus and M. Claudius Marcellus slew the kings of Caenina, Veii and a Gallic tribe.

4.10 advances P.’s strategy of surprise. Three areas may be explored: size, content and time. For this book, the poem is strikingly short (46 lines, excluding 25–6; other poems 146, 62, 70, 92, 76, 86, 96, 86, 70, 102 lines). Its brevity is marked out by its speeches. These have been extensive in book 4; but now we only have speeches of one and less than one line (15, 35). The last episode of the three is much the shortest (six lines, against 18 and 14): while Romulus’ deed may merit most space (cf. Val. Max. 3.2.4), the rapidity on Marcellus speeds the poem to its end.

Although the series of three is fixed by tradition (and Augustus), it is abnormal for a poem in book 4 to lack a single story, situation or central figure. The structure is neat and firmly marked; elaborate ring-form encloses the triple narrative. Such geometry is unexpected in P. There is little chance to get immersed in one tale; even the expansive passages (17–22, 27–30) are not parts of the stories.

The brevity should be seen in two related ways. First, the poem matches the cult: the temple was very small (D.H. *Ant.* 2.34.4), by contrast with that of Jupiter

Capitolinus; the number of victors was tiny, compared to the massive list of over 300 triumphs probably just placed on an arch in the Forum (*II* XIII 1.64–86; Intro. n. 4). What the poem presents is small but very special. Second, 4.10 joins epic pretensions with Callimachean littleness; stress on its *magnum iter* (3) brings out the paradox.

This leads to the surprises of content: 4.10, though Latin elegy, is unremittingly martial and masculine. Even in book 4, the feminine and love have contrived to keep appearing. Closest to 4.10 comes 4.6. Even 4.6 contains females (11–12, 22, 36, 46, 57, 61–2, 63–6, 75), and the world and language of love-elegy continue a discordant presence. Here they are sternly excluded. This forms part of the dialectic of the book. 4.9 has given a victory to the male over the female, and in 4.10 male warfare dominates entirely. But the bizarre bloodiness of the second and third episodes (as at Cat. 64.357–70) tests the reader's responses to these virile values.

Notable too is the small part played by the figure of the god who formally provides the subject. The relation of human and divine causes is a significant aspect of the poem; but the god himself only appears at the beginning and end of the poem, and of one couplet (15–16) which forms a microcosm of its action. He controls events, but is not vivid like Apollo or Vertumnus. Even 4.4 (30, 85–6, cf. 2) gives him more personality. For all the Virgilian language in 4.10, this forms a vital difference from the epic world.

Time presents various surprises, after the earlier poems. 4.10 deals with events that P. would set in 753, 428, 222 BC. This vast span resembles Livy 1–20 or Enn. *Ann.* 1–7 xvii Skutsch (cf. P. 3.3.6–12). But only rare moments are chosen. Again the poem is both quasi-epic and miniaturist. More complex, however, is the opposition of times.

Book 4 has largely been set in two contrasting eras: that of Romulus (and even further back in 4.9) and the present day. Unexpectedly, 4.10 and 4.11, like the shield in *Aeneid* 8, connect the contraries through the continuum of history. Yet the continuum is only partial. 4.10 brings us to one side of a divide in Roman history (for the perception cf. e.g. Polyb. 1.3.1–6, 3.1.4–10, 2.6): after 220 BC comes expansion beyond Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica. The latest episode, shortly before the Hannibalic War, is treated only briefly. The enemies in 4.10 are a city in Latium, then an old Etruscan enemy across the Tiber, then the ever-present Gauls, here fought in Italy. Rome's imposing conquests in Spain, Greece and Africa first appear in 4.11; 4.11 takes history to the present.

For the reader the duels are separated from the present world by the associations with epic warfare and the contrast with 4.6. There Octavian's opening spear-cast (56) can be only the symbolic equivalent of such a duel, in a world of vast forces. Duels were not really confined to early times, and in 12–9 BC Drusus was thought to aspire to the *spolia opima* (Suet. *Claud.* 1.4). But the poetic separation of the *spolia opima* from the present fits in neatly with Augustus' stance. In 28–27 BC M. Crassus had not dedicated the *spolia opima*, though arguably entitled

to (Dio 51.24.4). In some way linked seems Augustus' novel claim that Cossus was consul when he took the *spolia* (Livy 4.20.5–11, an arch passage). That claim also joins an existing debate on whether the Roman combatant (not dedicator) had to be *dux*; that debate will have used Cossus, and did use an alleged law of Numa's (Varro *ap. Fest.* p. 204 Lindsay; *RS* II 561–3). *dux* . . . *ducem* (46) takes the same line as Augustus. The portrayal of the *spolia* in the Forum Augustum, and their appearance at *II* XIII 1.78, Virg. *Aen.* 6.859, Man. 1.787–8, make it unlikely that P. is choosing material still awkward for Augustus.

Rome's rise in wealth is suggested by the description of Romulus (17–22), but is not presented in a continuous progression. The contrast is with the wealth and display of *other* cities (28, 44). Other cities complicate the Roman narrator's pride and confidence. Veii's fall, and king, are sympathetically treated, and might suggest wider mutability. Latium, like Italy, once contained enemies but becomes (cf. *Latias* 37) part of the very object of patriotism. Religion does unite Roman history in the poem, though the contact of man and god is most vivid with Romulus.

The book, then, starts in 4.10 to bridge its own chasm of time, but less simply and completely than might at first appear. 4.11, by developing the ideas of tradition and family, will bring unification closer. The surprises of 4.10 subsist, though reflection explains and modifies them. 4.10 drives the challenges and puzzles of the book to their limit: it is a small and exquisite encapsulation of masculine and epic ferocity. The final poem will achieve a kind of resolution, but not without its own austere renunciations.

Some discussions: Hubbard (1974) 128–34; C. Miralles, *Emerita* 38 (1970) 375–8; C. Edwards, *Writing Rome* (Cambridge 1996) 56–7; Fox (1996) 175–80; Rambaux (2001) 307–8; A. Bettenworth, *Hermes* 130 (2002) 122–6; DeBrohun (2003) 154–5, 198–9. On the *spolia opima* and related matters see H. Dessau, *Hermes* 41 (1906) 142–51; L. A. Springer, *CJ* 50 (1954/5) 27–32; Ogilvie edn. of Livy 1–5 pp. 563–7; E. Badian in G. Wirth (ed.), *Romanitas–Christianitas* (Berlin 1982) 18–41; J. Fries, *Der Zweikampf* (Königstein 1985) 36–66; S. P. Oakley, *CQ* 35 (1985) 392–410; S. J. Harrison, *CQ* 39 (1989) 408–14; G. B. Miles, *Livy* (Ithaca 1995) 40–7; *LTUR* III 135–6; J. W. Rich, *Chiron* 26 (1996) 85–127, *CQ* 49 (1999) 544–55; B. Liou-Gille, *Une lecture «religieuse» de Tite-Live I* (Paris 1998) 39–55; H. I. Flower, *CA* 19 (2000) 36–64; *MAR* 53.

¶ Nunc . . . incipiam teasingly makes the unpredictable and unchronological book sound like an orderly sequence: cf. e.g. Lucr. 4.29 *nunc agere incipiam* . . . , Vitr. 7.13.1 *incipiam nunc de ostro dicere*; *Epigoni* fr. 1 West (following the *Thebaid*) 'Now, in turn, let us begin singing of the younger men'. But this fits in with the ordered manner of 4.10. An opening *incipiam* suggests too the ambition of a large poem like the *Georgics* (1.5) or Lucretius (1.55 . . . *disserere incipiam et rerum primordia pandam*, cf. *aperire*). Aratus starts 'let us begin from Zeus' (1); in this book Jupiter has had to wait for Augustus (4.6.13–14). *nunc* recalls the rise to Augustus in 2.10 (1–3, 9–12).

aperire ‘explain’ (*TLL* s.v. 218.18–72), and also, with *arma*, ‘reveal’ (*OLD* s.v. 11a). The temple was probably closed to the public (F. Càssola, *Riv. Stor. It.* 81 (1970) 5–31; cf. the explicit *ingressum* at Livy 4.20.7). *causas* refers to the title *Feretrius*, as e.g. at Ov. *F.* 3.839 (*nominis*); for the gen. cf. ib. 6.1 *mensis habet dubias in nomine causas*.

2 armaque: epic (Virg. *Aen.* 1.1, cf. P. 2.1.18 etc.), but starting the pentameter.

trina ‘three’ (sets of *arma*); cf. Liv. 1.10.7 *bina . . . spolia*, *OLD* s.v. *trini* 2.

3–4 combine Hesiod’s ‘hard’ path to the height of excellence (*WD* 286–92) and his Mount Helicon (*Theog.* 1–34, cf. P. 2.10.25–6); so too e.g. Honest. *AP* 9.230 (*GP* 2418–21), cf. Ov. *AA* 2.535–8 (536 *magna cano*). The Capitol’s summit is relevant too: the narrator-poet imitates the victors who carry the *spolia opima* there *sub umeris* (47); cf. Livy 1.10.5 (*e/ascendit*); 5–22, 40, 47–8nn. Though he now seems to reach the epic greatness envisaged in 2.10 (*magnum* 6, 12, 20; *uires* 5, 11), *magnum* is made surprising by the smallness of the poem and (2) the number of the victors: cf. Livy 1.10.7, Plut. *Rom.* 16.7 etc. For related play cf. 4.6.69 *bella satis cecini*, and e.g. Virg. *G.* 3.289–94.

Creating the poet’s garland (4.1.61–2n.) is itself part of the hard task: cf. Pind. *Nem.* 7.77–9 (less ‘easy’ garland-making), Lucr. 1.929–30. *corona* plays on the triumphator’s garland, invented on this occasion (D.H. *Ant.* 2.34.2), but rarely won thus.

5–22 Romulus’ victory over Caenina begins the ‘Capitoline’ *Fasti triumphales* (*II XIII* 1.64, pl. XLVIII). He was later shown carrying the *spolia* in the Forum Augustum (Ov. *F.* 5.565, P. Zanker, *Forum Augustum* (Tübingen 1969) 16–18; painting, Pompeii IX 13.5 (*PPM* x 359); *LIMC* vii 1.640–1). The version of his *elogium* from Pompeii (*II XIII* 3.70) tells of his killing Acron and dedicating the *spolia*.

Caenina, perhaps vanished in P’s time (cf. Pliny *NH* 3.68–70), had been first to respond to the rape of the Sabine women; 4.4 forms a later part of the same story, graver for Rome. P is not simply following Livy or Livy’s source: neither Livy nor D.H. *Ant.* 2.33.2 names Acron (contrast e.g. Val. Max. 3.2.3). Nor does he depict a challenge, as in Val. Max. 3.2.3, Plut. *Rom.* 16.3: see 13–14n. Is Acron at the gates of Rome (so Goold, Heyworth) or of Caenina? Caenina: *ab hoste redis* (6) is less suitable if Acron is at Rome’s gates; *finibus horror* (10) is weak if he attacks Rome, but apt to the story of a raid on Roman territory (*OLD* s.v. *finis* 2a), met by Romulus (Livy 1.10.3–4; D.H. *Ant.* 2.33.2). *portas . . . petentem* (7), with *uictor*, fits closely D.H. *Ant.* 2.33.2 ‘pursuing those fleeing into the city’. It is natural language for those fleeing (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 11.868–71; Tac. *Hist.* 4.20.3). ‘Making for’ or ‘attacking’ the gates of Rome would give less obvious situation or language; as *portas* is undefined, the more obvious sense will prevail. If *turres* (13) are Roman, it sounds as though Romulus throws his spear from within the city: this hardly gives the heroic act needed, or fits the description in 17–22. If the *turres* are of Caenina, P is extending Virg. *Aen.* 7.631 *turrigeræ Antennæ* to its ally. Admittedly, there is a small shift: in 13–14 Acron is not literally in flight but defending the city. This accords with the general shift after 7–8 to presenting his aspirations.

His leading both raid and defence may combine different versions, or exploit an unclarity (cf. Livy 1.10.4, D.H. *Ant.* 2.33.2, Plut. *Rom.* 16.2).

The narrative is not straightforward: the event comes three times. 5–10 stress act and result, 9–12 expand on Acron's motives and action, 13–16 on Romulus and his deed. The elaboration on Romulus in 17–22 moralizes, but also creates a vivid image of the hero, like the descriptions of Theseus (Bacch. 18.46–60) or Jason (Pind. *Pyth.* 4.78–83).

5–6 As is shown by the argument and (however understood) *huius, primae* refers to the ranking of *spolia opima* as best of the three types of *spolia*: so the 'law of Numa' must be taken (Fest. p. 204 Lindsay; there *opima* replaces *prima*). The phrase adapts *palma prima* 'first prize' (cf. *OLD* s.v. *palma* 5 *fin.*, 6b). Only secondarily suggested are 'the first triumph', and 'the first success of this kind' (cf. Man. 1.787 *tertia palma*).

huius in agreement with *palmae* leaves the type of spoil in 6 unlimited (the late distinctions in *TLL* s.v. *exuviae* 2130.10–18 (incl. 'Suet.') do not fit classical usage). The emphatic demonstrative is unnecessary and unwelcome. It might be better to read *palmae*, | *huius et exuvii* (Hutchinson: -ii gen. 1.6.34 etc.). *palmae* could then be dat.; *exemplum* is a sort of internal acc., like *uer* 3, with *imbuo* 'inaugurate, begin' (*OLD* s.v. 3, 4; Val. Max. 3.2.4 *incohata gloria*). The sing. *exuvium*, only here, expresses the uniqueness of the enemy leader's arms (cf. *spolium* 16), especially after *plenus* 'loaded with' (Stat. *Theb.* 2.682 etc.); it could not alone specify the *spolia opima*. It matches *balneum* / -ae, *delicium* / -ae, *epulum* / -ae, *exsequium* / -ae (cf. *CIL* v 2072.2–3). But *exuvius* (ς) is a possibility. *ut* (Phillimore), with hist. pres. as e.g. Ov. *Met.* 1.324–6, would deal with the absence of 'you first' in 6.

tu: the contact between narrator and character made by the apostrophe is missing with Cossus and Claudius (23, 39).

8 One shot makes the horse fall (*OLD* s.v. *euerto* 3b); another slays Acron (*OLD* s.v. *fundo* 13b).

9–10 *Herculeus* 'descended from Hercules' makes Acron formidable; *Caenina* makes the threat to the now great Rome surprising. The address to Rome sharpens the point. The intertext Lucr. 3.1034 *Scipiadas . . . Carthaginis horror* adds a contrast with subsequent history. (*horror* 'the terror of', cf. *OLD* s.v. 7b.) *Herculeus* also reminds us, after 4.9, that Rome's traditions are not unique; cf. 4.7.82 (Tibur).

ductor: not *rex*, though *ab arce* shows his kingship (cf. e.g. Lucr. 5.1108–9, Virg. *Aen.* 7.170–2). The rules on the *spolia opima* are being stressed: cf. 3, 31, 40, 46; *II* XIII 1.78 *duce hostium*.

If 4.9–10 are spurious, this more aptly handled expansion may be their model.

11–12 emphasize irony and error, and conjure up the *Aeneid*: cf. e.g. 10.457–63 (Pallas, *ausum* | *uiribus imparibus*, hopes to despoil Turnus), 12.348–52 (Dolon dares desire Achilles' horses). Acron's folly is impious: *Quirini* superimposes Romulus' future divinity (cf. 4.9.32, 11.60). *dedi*t plays on victors giving spoils to Quirinus (as Virg. *Aen.* 6.859, Plut. *Marc.* 8.9). In fact this is a loser's 'giving' (cf. e.g.

Livy 23.46.14), as is stridently emphasized by *sed*, an unusually placed *non* (cf. Tib. 1.8.22), and archaizing heavy alliteration (cf. Ed. Wölfflin, *ALL* 14 (1906) 515–23). The Virgilian ‘dry from blood’ (*Aen.* 8.261, *al*) is turned into grim litotes.

13–14 13 suggests that neither has previously seen the other here. Romulus is just arriving in pursuit. He can be said to get in first (*occupat ante*: cf. *OLD* s.v. *occupo* 11a, 12), although Acron, as *uidet . . . librantem* indicates, is not balancing his spear to throw at him in particular (*OLD* s.v. *libro* 3; *spicula* probably sing. for pl. as e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 9.409 *tela*). *occupat* refers not, as expected, to Romulus’ throw but to the vital prayer; so Ov. *F.* 4.895 *uota ualent meliora*.

cauas . . . turres: another Virgilian phrase (*Aen.* 9.46), of the Trojan defence.

ratis ‘fulfilled’, because the prayer makes a statement about the future.

15–16 One couplet, ringed with Jupiter’s name, unites vow and fulfilment; this conveys divine and heroic rapidity. Contrast the prayer *after* the killing at Livy 1.10.6. P’s vow compresses the standard ‘I vow *x* if you do *y*’ (e.g. Livy 10.19.17, 42.7). Paradoxically, the reciprocal actions of Romulus and Jupiter are the same: Acron is himself vowed, as sacrifice (and spoil). The simultaneity is stressed by *hic hodie* (Enn. *Trag.* 307 Jocelyn etc.; *hic* = ‘here’): cf. Livy 1.24.8 *hic hodie feriam* (sacrifice), *CIL* vi 2074.35 *hodie* (vow). *haec* (NFLA) would make Acron an awkward addition. Romulus, confident in Jupiter, and himself, can use one unconditional future. Cf. Ov. *F.* 4.894 (Aeneas to Jupiter) *feres. corruet . . . corruit* conveys the neat inevitability. The fall is intensified by play on *ἄκρος* *summus* (cf. *arce* 9?).

uictima: the sacrificial language recalls disturbing passages in the *Aeneid* (esp. 12.296 (of a human) *haec melior magnis data uictima diuis*); but the narrator is not disturbed.

17 Vrbis . . . parens: common language for Romulus (Enn. *Ann.* 108 Skutsch, Livy 1.16.6, 5.24.11), already used of his emulator Augustus. Cf. e.g. *RIC*¹ Aug. 99 100 (c. 18 BC), obverse *SPQR PARENT(i)* above emblems of triumph (*CONS(eruatori)* *SVO* beneath); N–H on Hor. *C.* 1.2.50, N–R on 3.24.27–8. *uirtutisque* (Rome’s valour) indicates that such fatherhood has a moral dimension too: cf. Hor. *C.* 3.24.25–64, Luc. 9.601. There are, then, continuities in Roman history, precisely through early poverty (contrast 4.1.29–38).

sic refers primarily to manner (swift, valorous), cf. *uirtutisque* and 18; but 14–16 demand an additional reference to cause: prayer and Jupiter (cf. Romulus’ later prayer at Livy 1.12.3–7). So Augustus’ customary victories (4.6.24, 39) are aided by Apollo.

18 tulit a ‘endured as a result of’ (*OLD* s.v. *ab* 15a). Parsimony with fire may be especially indicated: though *lare* is primarily ‘house’ here, Lares were gods of the hearth. Imperviousness to cold is remarked in e.g. Caesar (Cic. *Rab. Post.* 42) – and Catiline (*Cat.* 2.9, *al.*, Sal. *Cat.* 5.3).

19 The same horse of Romulus was furnished with bridle (in warfare, cf. e.g. Livy 1.14.9) and the plough; cf. *OLD* s.v. *aptus* 4. ‘Was (thought) suitable to’ would need a word more specific to warfare than *frenis*; and a concrete statement fits

better with 20–2. The same points tell against *equus* (Ω), which does not suit *aratus*. Cf. A. Bettenworth, *Hermes* 130 (2002) 122–7; similarly Heyworth (cf. also (1986) 211). A possessive *huic* (Hutchinson; cf. e.g. 1.14.11, Virg. *Ecl.* 3.100–3, *Aen.* 8.631) would be desirable to make the connection with Romulus. It would replace *et*, or possibly the first *idem*: the idiom *idem . . . idem* is not found in Augustan or earlier poetry.

20 Helmet, and horse, show a different picture from the glamorous triumph, instituted on Acron's defeat: cf. 4.1.32, 4.53–4n.; 1.29. *lupina* recalls Romulus' earliest days (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 1.275); *hirsuta* links him with old Ennius (4.1.61) and Hercules (9.49).

21–2 present contrasts with both modern generals and epic heroes. *pyropum*, an alloy of gold and bronze (Pliny *NH* 34.94), appears in Ovid's divine world (*Met.* 2.2); it here adds a thin layer (*OLD* s.v. *induco* 16) to the horseman's light shield. Decorated epic and modern sword-belts are recalled (cf. e.g. Hom. *Il.* 11.236–7, Virg. *Aen.* 10.496–9 (Pallas); Sen. *Ep.* 76.14; M. C. Bishop and J. C. N. Coulston, *Roman military equipment* (London 1993) 74, 96–8); but even they normally have hide for their basis.

lenta 'supple' (*OLD* s.v. 1a), with no metallic adornments.

23–38 On the events, cf. T. J. Cornell, *The beginnings of Rome* (London 1995) 309–13; on Veii, A. M. Moretti Sgubini (ed.), *Veio, Cerveteri, Vulci* (Rome 2001) 1–105. P's account differs much more than in 5–22 from Livy (4.17–20) and Dionysius (*Ant.* 12.5, excerpt). There Cossus rides against Lars Tolumnius, king of Etruscan Veii (15 km from Rome), as he fights on horse outside Fidenae (9 km from Rome), with the Fidenates and Falisci as allies. In P. the fight seems all on foot (36). Tolumnius is challenged from within a besieged Veii, though Veii was not besieged, in the usual account, until 406–396 bc. Fidenae and Falerii are forgotten: *Latias* 37 shows this for the Latin Fidenae. P. could be following an odd source (but Flor. 1.6.9 *spolia . . . reportata* may be spurious (Hutchinson)). More likely he deliberately conflates events, in order to dwell on the fall of Rome's one-time rival Veii. Decapitation and horses (37–8) return us to Livy or his source (4.18.8, 19.4–5, D.H. l.c.). The attack on a city joins the episode to that of Romulus, the challenge dissimilates it. But the challenge could be derived from one version of the episode of Romulus, 5–22n.

The section elaborates on the fate of Veii before recounting the battle (contrast Livy 5.22.8 and esp. Flor. 1.6.11), and just after the expansion on Romulus (17–22). The narration itself (31–8) covers only a short time. It omits Tolumnius' starting of the war (Livy 4.17.1–6, 58.7), and possible perfidy; the siege, so long on the standard account, appears only as background within the episode (33–4).

23 insequitur in sequence and time. As at 1 and 5 clear ordering is stressed: cf., with exposition, time, and space variously involved, Cic. *Fam.* 9.21.3 *deinde Carbones et Turdi insequuntur*, Vitruvius 2.9.17 *insequitur animaduversio . . .*, *Il. Lat.* 174–5, Val. Fl. 1.398. A parade of worthies more select than Virgil's may be suggested (cf. *Aen.* 6.815 *sequitur*).

caede Tolumni ‘because of his killing of T.’. The name originates in a Veientine context: *Tulumnes* is found only at Veii (*ET* Ve 3.2, 3.6; M. Pittau, *Testi etruschi* (Rome 1990) 40–1); Lars is the praenomen *Lar*9. Some are confident that the event is historical.

24 dismissively undercuts the hexameter. *posse* stresses the difficulty (cf. e.g. 3.3.4 *neruis hiscere posse meis*); the absence of e.g. *magni* with *laboris* perhaps increases the surprise (‘a thing of effort’; cf. Col. 2.17.1). Awareness of the usual history is indicated: cf. Livy 5.2.1, 7 (*labor*), 4.4 (*labor*), 16.8, 22.8–23.3; Diod. 14.43.5, 93.2.

[25–6] (del. Heyworth) disrupt the thought (27–8n.); they are probably an embellishment of 24. *neclum* places us before the fall of Veii, which is on the far side of the Tiber; the capture of Cora places us over fifty years later (cf. Livy 8.13.12). The same strange combination makes transposition after 8 or 22 futile. For Nomentum and Cora, in Latium, see Oakley on Livy 8.14.3, 19.5.

iugera terna for each Roman settler; cf. Livy 8.11.14 (*bina in Latino iugera*).

27–8 As the narrator addressed Rome at 10, combining past and present, so he now addresses an enemy city, whose fortunes have gone the other way. The breadth of vision is striking (cf. Hdt. 1.5.3–4), even if *heu* were to be read as expressing the city’s emotion. The specific point is that Veii had a king, Tolumnius (23), and so was a *regnum*; this point is lost if 25–6 interrupt. *et* connects Veii with the Rome of Romulus’, not Tolumnius’, day; *tum*, of Tolumnius’ time, contrasts with *nunc* in 29. The golden chair for doing business matches, and perhaps excels, Rome; Rome derived from the Etruscans themselves her ivory *sella curulis* for kings and later magistrates (Livy 1.8.3, 20.2, D.H. *Ant.* 3.61.1, 62.1–2, M. Cristofani in M. Cristofani (ed.), *Etruschi* (Florence 2000) 129–30). For golden *sellae* as royal, cf. Mommsen (1887–8) 1 397–408, S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (Oxford 1971) 272–3. The heavy alliteration of *u* (cf. 24) reinforces *ueteres* with an archaic device.

29–30 The inside of the city is now pastoral; contrast 28, cf. e.g. Alph. Myt. *AP* 9.101, 104 Mycenae, Argos). Rome’s evolution is reversed: cf. 4.1.12–13 (horn summons *senators*), 4.5–6 (pastoral pipes), 63 (*military* horn). For the *bucina* to call animals cf. Varro *RR* 2.4.20, 3.13.1, 3. *lenti* suggests a lack of urgency; G. B. A. Fletcher, *Latomus* 48 (1989) 359 compares Virg. *Ecl.* 1.4 *lentus*. Since Veii was captured from within, the bones and reaped fields (*OLD*s.v. *meto* 1c) may be within the former city too; this would give a clearer contrast with 27–8. (*in uestris ossibus* is ‘amid the bones of your dead’.) The image recalls the Roman bones at Virg. *G.* 1.493–7. *pastoris* and *arua metunt* conjure up significantly the unmartial Virgilian genres (cf. 2.34.61–84).

Veii had been a magnificent city, after its fall a possible new site for Rome (Livy 5.49.8–55.5, *II* XIII 3.38–9); but 29–30 exaggerate its present state. It remains a small settlement at Cic. *Agr.* 2.96 (cf. Strabo 2.530). 29–30 probably, Luc. 7.392–3 and Flor. 1.6.11 certainly, postdate the *municipium Augustum Veiens* (before AD 1). *intra muros* calls to mind the place’s unusual terminology: *municipes intramurani* and *extramurani* (*CIL* XI 3797–9, 3808). The narrator would be seen to overstate, as he is often seen in P.’s love-poetry. Cf. J. Ward-Perkins, *PBSR* 16 (1961) 52–75; L.

Vagnetti, *Il deposito votivo di Campetti a Veio* (Florence 1971) 173–4; E. Papi, *L'Etruria dei Romani* (Rome 2000) 103–15.

31–2 The initial *forte* moves us strongly into narrative mode: cf. e.g. Virg. *Ecl.* 7.1, Tac. *Hist.* 4.27.1. It demands a chance event: hardly the king intending to open negotiations with the consul (*petit* Heinsius). Rather, he happened to be standing where Cossus could ask to talk; he allowed this (Caes. *Civ.* 2.27.2 *colloquendi dare facultatem*, Livy 34.30.5 *dandum colloquium*). Cossus' talk is not the expected negotiation. *fretus* (Ω) would need an abl.; *sua* . . . *ab urbe* needs binding into the sentence. One possibility might be *uersus* (Hutchinson), which would enhance *forte*: Tolumnius had been facing into the city. Cf. *OLD* s.v. *uerto* 10a, 11c, Stat. *Theb.* 6.940 (*a fine*), Sil. 13.2–3 (*ad urbem*).

portae . . . arcem 'on a tower of the gate': cf. *TLL* s.v. *arx* 740.31–8, Livy 27.28.12 *turribus portae*, 37.40.4 *turribusque superstantes*. *portam* . . . *arcis* (Heyworth) would be too distant for the dialogue.

Veius: *Veius*, as if Veii were foreign; cf. Leumann (1977) 129. For the adj. cf. Plut. *Cam.* 2.5, 17.4, for the scansion Rufin. *Ant. GLK* vi 563.6 (cf. Housman (1972) III 1104).

33 The backward change of Veii to a shepherd's haunt (29–30) is here caused by an ironic perversion of the pastoral: a ram assails the walls with its horn (cf. *muros, pastoris, bucina* 29). Veii's *egregius muris* (Livy 5.2.7) cost Rome much trouble. On the ram, and its protecting *uinea*, see Athen. *Mech.* 9–10 (with Whitehead and Blyth's nn.), Vitruvius 10.13.1–3; O. Lendle, *Texte und Untersuchungen zum technischen Bereich der antiken Poliorketik* (Wiesbaden 1983) 136–41, 188–91, 197–201. Roman authors routinely ascribe these devices to the distant past: Virg. *Aen.* 12.706, Livy 2.17.1–5 etc.

34 opus denotes, or includes, the *aries*: see *TLL* s.v. *opus* 848.71–7. Hence *qua* (Ω) is distinctly strange (cf. also Heyworth). Apter than *-que inductum* (ς) would be *-que adductum* (Hutchinson); cf. Corippus *Joh.* 2.400 *ariete* . . . *adducto*; Livy 21.7.5 *uineas* . . . , *per quas aries moenibus admoueri posset*, 8.2, 10.10.

35–6 The brevity and speed of the couplet express both men's characters. The challenges at e.g. Livy 25.18.6, Virg. *Aen.* 11.705–8 are longer. Such duels are scary (cf. Val. Max. 3.2.3), even in epic (Hom. *Il.* 7.92–160; Virgil, *Aeneid* 12).

forti should go with Cossus, after *concurrere*. A duel is not 'better for' the king (cf. e.g. Cic. *Phil.* 13.30 *melius rei publicae fuit* . . . ?). *forti campo*, 'the field, where men are brave', is not obvious sense like *aequo* . . . *solo* (Virg. *Aen.* 11.706–7); and as one general addresses the other, single combat would not be clearly enough indicated. This also tells against *fortis* (Markland); for *concurrere* of one party cf. Virg. *Aen.* 12.570–1. *forti (mihi)* would imply a taunt; yet the additional pointed *campo* makes the speech less pithy. *campo* has all the more point as Veii stood on a rocky plateau; cf. D.H. *Ant.* 2.54.3. Perhaps, then, *fortem* (Hutchinson), 'a brave man'; cf. e.g. Plut. *Marius* 33.4 (challenge by opponent's qualities). There would be no dat. (so Virg. *Aen.* 10.715, 12.571): the sing. would make the adversary evident.

37–8 Again divine causation is crucial, but Jupiter is not named, or vowed to. The account of the killing is more lavish than the litotes at 12, more graphic than *caputque abscisum* (Livy 4.19.5, cf. Virg. *Aen.* 8.438 *desecto . . . collo* of the Gorgon). *sanguine lauit equos* perverts the image of Athena washing her horses after battle (Call. *Hy.* 5.5–12: epicizing elegy; *lauo* of blood in poetry *TLL* s.v. 1052.13–26). The gore, Veii's fate, and Tolumnius' courage complicate responses to this surge of piety and patriotism in the narrator.

39–44 suggest the historical context briefly, and elaborately describe the Gallic leader, the poem's first non-Italian. The description forms a counterpart to that of Romulus (17–22). Both have a *parma*, but *torquis* (44) contrasts with Romulus' lack of shining metal (20–2, cf. 28). 39 stresses the factor which distinguished the Gallic threat in 222 BC from that in 224: some Gauls crossed into Italy (contrast 10). Details will derive from historical accounts of these years, and highlight Viridumarus' ethnicity: *uasti* (cf. Plut. *Marc.* 7.1), opposed to the small shield (cf. Polyb. 2.30.3 on the unfortunate relation of size and Gallic shield); chariot (Plut. *Marc.* 6.7–8, 7.1); trousers (43), significant in the fighting (Polyb. 2.30.1); the torc (44), important spoil (Polyb. 2.31.5; Viridumarus' gold: Plut. *Marc.* 7.1).

Claudius has no speech (contrast Plut. *Marc.* 7.4), and little vivid presence in the account. He was associated with Augustus' Marcellus (*d.* 23 BC; 3.18.33, Aug. *Or.* fr. 14 Malcovati, Virg. *Aen.* 6.855–83); *Claudius* would enable association with Tiberius and Drusus, if the book follows their victories in 15 BC (Hor. *C.* 4.4.73 *Claudiae . . . manus*, cf. e.g. Suet. *Tib.* 1–2 for the Claudii as an entity). This only makes the brevity of 39–44 more notable (contrast *II* XIII 1.78). The backward-looking poem restrains gestures towards present deeds.

For the *duces* see *RE* III 2738–55, Suppl. xv 918–30; for the Gauls (Insubres and Gaesatae) M. T. Grassi, *I Celti in Italia* (Milan 1991), esp. 29–33, 111–15 (pls. 2, 7, 34 for torcs, 13 for javelin); J.-L. Brunaux and B. Lambot, *Guerre et armement chez les Gaulois* (Paris 1987) 94–5, 97–9, 115–18.

39 Eridanum (Guyet): the Po is central to these events (cf. Val. Max. 3.2.5). The Gauls crossed it to besiege Clastidium, and it marks the region from which they were expelled (Polyb. 2.31.8, 34.5, 35.4, Plut. *Marc.* 6.4). For the acc. see *OLD* s.v. *traicio* 6d; Passerat's abl. 'by the Po' (Livy 21.56.9?) gives the boundary less force. *II* XIII 1.78 strangely has Marcellus triumph *de Galleis Insubribus et Germi*; but this would not justify such emphasis on the Rhine (*a Rheno* Ω), and Viridumarus is depicted as a Gaul (43–4). *Belgica* of an artefact, on the other hand, seems endurable vagueness.

40 cui (Guyet) avoids an odd 'when'; by making Marcellus the agent, it implies the dedication. Cf. *II* XIII 1.78 *spolia opima rettu[lit]*, Livy *Epit.* 20; *RRC* no. 439 (pl. LII; M. Harlan, *Roman Republican moneyers and their coins* (London 1995) ch. 29): Marcellus carrying the trophy into the temple.

41 Viridumari (thus probably *II* XIII 1.78): the name of the *uasti* . . . *ducis* exceeds the couplet. Isolation highlights its Gallic quality: *-marus* is very common

in Gallic names (cf. X. Delamarre, *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise* (Paris 2003) 218–19; 321 for *uirido*). *-māri* is surprising, and may give grounds for suspecting word or couplet: cf. P.-Y. Lambert, *La langue gauloise* (Paris 1994) 28, 32, 85; *Ricaamaariu(s)* D. Ellis Evans, *Gaulish personal names* (Oxford 1967) 227.

iactabat: Gauls have traditions too (cf. Hom. *Il.* 14.113–14 ‘I boast to be from Tydeus in race (γένος)’). Brennus (*Rheno* Ω) will be the Gaul who took Rome shortly after Rome took Veii (cf. Livy 5.48.8, Sil. 4.150–3); but the Brennus defeated by a god (279 BC) can be added into the violent lineage (cf. 2.31.13, 3.13.51–4, Polyb. 2.35.7, Livy 40.58.3).

42 nobilis (ς) better accompanies the boast (for the inf. cf. Hor. *C.* 1.12.26–7; Sil. 12.331); *inuictis* (e.g.) might further sustain the level (*rotis* = ‘chariot’, *OLD* s.v. 1c). *rectis* ‘driven’ says little; an explicit *ante aciem* would be needed for *euctis* (Rothstein; for the use with *rotis* cf. Val. Fl. 2.35).

gaesa ‘javelins’ is of Gallic origin; it hints at *Gaesatae* (39–44n.).

43–4 The series *gaesa*, stripes, torc recalls Virg. *Aen.* 8.659–62 (Gauls on the Capitol); but now the barbaric adornment is undone. ‘The curved torc’ falling from the severed throat is, like 37–8, unobvious but gory. *excisa* (Hutchinson) fits and explains better than *incisa* ‘cut into’; cf. Sil. 15.470, Apul. *Met.* 4.15.3, 9.38.7 (*abscido*, *exseco*, neck or throat), *OLD* s.v. *excido*² 1a. *maculanti* (Waardenburgh) should refer to Viridumarus: the *bracas* are his. (*hic* 41 expands on the new person, rather than forming a pair with *illi*; *illi* takes him up, as e.g. at Virg. *Aen.* 2.86.) With *iaculantis*, *bracis* is not adequately attached to the (dubious) syntax. Cf. G. P. Goold, *HSCP* 69 (1965) 95 and (1966) 89–90.

45 haec, probably a conjecture in P for *nec* (LF), sums up neatly (*sic* would also be possible). The place of the emphatic *nunc* (NA) . . . *condita* (sc. *sunt*) in the exposition is not clear.

46 omine . . . certo refers to the crucial defeat of the enemy force (cf. 7–8, 24, 39), presaged by the defeat of the leader (*ferio* implies killing as at Virg. *Aen.* 12.304 etc.). Cf. Val. Max. 3.2.3: despite numerical superiority, Romulus *sua* . . . *dextra omen uictoriae corripuit*; Virg. *Aen.* 10.310–11 with Harrison ad loc. *omine* does not suit a vow; a reference to the general’s auspices before the battle less naturally makes *omine certo* precede the killing (S. J. Harrison, *CQ* 39 (1989) 411–12).

dux ferit ense ducem: the etymology is presented with a Virgilian phrase (*ferit ense Aen.* 12.458, cf. 6.251 etc.). *ipse* (Damsté) undesirably removes emphasis from the etymology. For *dux duc-* in the rule see Livy 4.20.6, *II XIII* 3.70, Fest. p. 202 Lindsay etc.

47–8 The ring at 45 (cf. 1) had seemed to show closure at 46. But now *causas* (i) emerges as a true plural; another ring makes the poem end with Jupiter (cf. 1) not men (46, cf. 2). *arma*, which embody the defeat (cf. *uictricia* at Sen. *Rh. Con.* 4.4), give place to *ara*: cf. Ov. *F.* 1.13, with Green ad loc. For *seu quia* introducing the alternative etymology and *aition* cf. e.g. Call. *Aet.* fr. 79 (*Dieg.*), Varro *LL* 7.44, Ov. *F.* 2.475–80; P. R. Hardie, *MD* 26 (1991) 63, and 4.2.11–12n.

suis: so Livy 1.10.5 *ipse* (but with *feretrum*; cf. 3–4n.), Flor. 1.1.11 *manibus suis*.

haec takes up the resumptive *haec* of 45. With *quia* ... *hinc* cf. Varro *LL* 5.68, 133. *in templo* (45) suggests the sanctuary is not imagined as 'here' (*huc* Broekhuysen).

superba conveys the height of the location (*OLD* s.v. 1c), Jupiter's pride in the spoils, and perhaps the haughtiness of the altar, more exclusive than the *Ara Maxima* of 4.9.

4.11: CORNELIA

The finale springs one last surprise. Nothing is heard from the poet-narrator; Cornelia (C.) seems more remote from the values of love-elegy than the book's other women. Book 1 ended with the *narrator's* origins, book 2 (or 2b) with his literary *gens* (2.34.85–94) and Cynthia's and his immortality (cf. 4.11.101–2), book 3 with their break-up and Cynthia's old age. In her life and its cohesion C. contrasts with him as seen in the opening poem. Neatly too, his complete absence in 4.11 takes up that in the first two poems after the prologue. Thus for all the absence and the surprise, authorial control appears.

The family of Paullus Aemilius Lepidus (*cos. suff.* 34, *PIR*² A373) was particularly close to Augustus (cf. 58–60); the poem thus resembles 3.18, on the death of the still closer Marcellus. Paullus was made censor in 22 (42n.), an exceptional honour. He later married Augustus' niece; his son married Augustus' granddaughter (63–4, 91–2nn.). His wife C. was daughter of Augustus' first wife Scribonia. Readers are to view C.'s exemplary life as illuminating Augustus' recent social laws (47–8n.), whatever the exact year of her death ([65–6]n.; age 25–31?). Some readings interestingly suppose a hidden fear or anger in C.; they perhaps treat the character constructed by the text too much like an actual person. (Cf. Johnson (bibliography below) 171–3.)

To some degree, C. reconciles or confuses notional oppositions in the book, between public and private, past and present, men and women, even gods and mortals. She does so through the idea of the family – to be contrasted with the narrator's childless ménage. The poem extends from a family tradition which embodies central Roman victories to intimate feelings concealed between father and children. It is relevant that Roman houses show complex relations between 'public' and 'private' (cf. A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and society in Pompeii and Herculaneum* (Princeton 1994) chs. 2–3); that Augustus' legislation makes sexual behaviour the concern of the state; that public celebration of the female dead was increasing (Caesar delivered a funeral oration on his own wife, *ORF* 121 F 30–1 (aunt F 28–9); cf. *CIL* VI 41062).

4.11 shows the mechanisms through which past values are transmitted; but we do not, as in 4.6.37–44, get back to Rome's origins. In fact the poem contributes to a construction. C. apparently claims to descend from the Younger Scipio and so from Aemilius Paullus. Both claims are impossible (there is a light reminder at 97), like Paullus' claim to descend from Aemilius Paullus (29–30, 39–40nn.). Paullus did not even belong by descent to the Aemilii Paulli (cf. O. Salomies, *Die römischen*

Vornamen (Helsinki 1987) 320–1). C.'s membership of the Corneli Scipiones is made problematic by her brother, apparently from the same marriage, Cornelius (Lentulus) Marcellinus (55–60n.); the Corneli Lentuli variously encroach on old branches of the Corneli (cf. Ser. Cornelius Lentulus Maluginensis, *cos. suff.* AD 10). But C. speaks as a Scipio; she even approaches Scipionic near-divinity (101–2), to end a book which has in its central figures set mortal women against male gods. (On the tomb of the Scipios, important for the family, see *CIL* I² 6–16 (A. Degrassi, *Imagines* (Berlin 1965) nos. 132–8); F. Coarelli, *Revixit ars* (Rome 1996) 179–238, *LTUR* IV 281–5, *MAR* 224.)

Generically, 4.11 is an aetiological expansion of an epigram on an object; the main type of epigram in question is not Greek book-epigram but Latin epitaph. 4.11 presents itself as inscribed (36); unnarrated address to living relatives occurs often in Greek and Latin inscribed epitaphs, not in book-epigram. Details of language confirm the evocation of Latin epitaph (1, 13–14, 17nn.). Through Greek inscribed epitaphs, to which Latin inscribed epitaphs are greatly indebted, even post-Republican Latin material can be used to show thoughts and themes as epitaphic for P. Funerary inscriptions, seen in their original layout and setting, provide a crucial context for 4.11 (cf. e.g. D. Bosung, *Antike Grabaltäre aus den Nekropolen Roms* (Bern 1987)). Most striking is the emotional restraint of C. as wife in so long a piece. Her hypermatronal language contrasts with the narrator's and Cynthia's open and elegiac emotionalism, but also with the wife's warmth in e.g. *CIL* VI 12652 (1st cent. AD; Bosung no. 904, G. L. Gregorio and M. Mattei, *Imagines. Roma (CIL VI)* 1 (Rome 1999) no. 39) or I² 1221 (A. Degrassi, *Imagines* (Berlin 1965) no. 303; the legal joining of hands in the relief has here emotional significance too).

P. exploits inscriptions with Hellenistic self-consciousness. He pursues, in Callimachean vein, the strangeness of epigraphic communication (cf. *Call. Ep.* 13, 15, 18 Pfeiffer), intensified in communication from the dead; even in actual epitaphs complications are felt (cf. e.g. *SGO* I 01/01/07.11–14 (1st cent. BC)). Interest in women's epitaphs as such is shown by the section of epigrams Posid. 42–61 A–B.

The epitaph is enlarged, after its opening section on the finality of death, by the elaboration of a defence-speech to the judges of the underworld. Judges for all the dead appear in Greek epitaphs (19n.). Plato is particularly important for the conception; cf. *Apol.* 40e7–41a6, *Gorg.* 523a1–527a4, [*Axiach.*] 371a1–372a8. The last passage illustrates the expected sequence: gates, river crossing, trial. C. has not yet crossed rivers at 15–16, cf. 69–70; the trial should not be happening. It begins as a hypothesis (*hodie* 25 suggests an imminent hypothesis). The speech can be seen as ambiguous: a sort of rehearsal, or a scene C. imagines, or actuality. Firm actuality is only suggested by the perhaps questionable 99–100; the poem floats away from the defence by 73. The device enables extended self-praise from C., despite her reserve (cf. Livy 38.50.11–12 (Elder Scipio on trial), *Plut. Laud. Sui* 540c–541a; *CIL* VI 40948). Her account of her life expands on female as well

as male inscriptions (cf. e.g. *CIL* 1² 1211, 1836, 3197 (fasc. 4 (Berlin 1986) pl. 70)). Elegiac *epicedia* for women (Parth. fr. 1–6, 17 Lightfoot) will also be relevant (see Intro. section 4).

The requests to husband and children (73–98) stand in epitaphic territory (73–4n.). Their context is enriched by non-literary utterances, and Euripides' *Alcesteis*. The connections with *Alcesteis* are picked up in the Barcelona *Alcesteis* poem (P. J. Parsons, R. G. M. Nisbet and G. O. Hutchinson, *ΣPE* 52 (1983) 31–6; commentary M. Marcovich (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 103, 1988)). The myth appears on second-century AD sarcophagi, with the death as a Roman death-scene; but *Alcesteis*' return to life is always indicated (cf. D. Grassinger, *Die mythologischen Sarkophage* 1 (Berlin 1999) 110–28, 227–34, pls. 74–85). In 4.11 the opening has ruled out return. Restraint on emotion creates the poem's most moving passage. Particularly hidden, but implied, is C.'s deep affection for Paullus. The values of the narrator in 4.5, 7, 8 are less remote from C.'s than appears on the surface.

The narrator's absence marks the author's self-control, surpassing C.'s; the author's creative control and range are spectacularly displayed. His poetry, larger than the narrator or C., has escaped from Cynthia's thrall, drawn the book's contraries closer together, and achieved a special power in ending.

Some discussions: E. Garr in W. Eisenhut (ed.), *Antike Lyrik*, 2nd edn. (Darmstadt 1995) 365–74; W. Eisenhut, *WJ* 4 (1949/50) 53–9; L. C. Curran, *CP* 63 (1968) 134–9; G. Paduano, *Maia* 20 (1968) 21–8; Williams (1968) 387–400; E. Reitzenstein, *RhM* 112 (1969) 126–45; id., *Über die Elegie des Propertius auf den Tod der Cornelia* (AMAW 1970.6); D. K. Lange in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin literature and Roman history* 1 (Brussels 1979) 335–42; Butrica (1984) 197–201; J. Hallett in R. Winkes (ed.), *The age of Augustus* (Louvain-la-Neuve 1985) 73–88; R. Cotterill in A. Benjamin (ed.), *Post-structuralist classics* (London 1988) 235–6; Wyke (2002) 108–14; W. R. Johnson in D. H. Roberts, F. M. Dunn and D. Fowler (edd.), *Classical closure* (Princeton 1997) 163–80; J. K. Newman, *Augustan Propertius* (Hildesheim 1997) 330–7; A. Finkenauer, *RhM* 144 (2001) 147–59; Janan (2001) ch. 9; Rambaux (2001) 309–12; DeBrohun (2003) 153–4, 196–8; B. Dufallo, *Helios* 30 (2003) 163–79.

1 Desine directly evokes actual epitaphs: cf. *CIL* 1² 1215.b3 *desinite . . . lacrimas fundere* (virtual start of speech from dead girl, cf. vi 12562.a12–15 (*ML* 180; 1st cent. AD)); 1² 1223.13–14 *desine iam frustra, mater mea . . .*, reused vi 20370.9, cf. *AE* 1990 nos. 95.4–5, 99.3 (1st–2nd cent. AD). It also forms a clausal signal for the book.

lacrimis: epitaphs highlight their commissioners' grief; cf. *CIL* vi 12562.c19–22, a, 24049.5–6, 24800.6 (husbands). Cynthia began by censuring a lack of grief (4.7.13–14).

urgere suggests both pleading and weighing on (*OLD* s.v. 10a; 3a). Cf. [Sen.] *HO* 1833 *non est gemendus nec graui urgendus prece (nece codd.)*; P. 4.5.76 (with 4.5.1n.), Tib. 1.4.60.

2 The *preces* are to gods, C., the door; Paullus is like a lover (cf. P. 1.16, Tib. 1.5.67–8 *nec uerbis uicta patescit | ianua; ad* ‘in response to’, cf. *OLD* s.v. 29a, Ov. *Her.* 11.63 *ad tua uerba reuixi*). His wish is for her to return (cf. 3–4) through the door of death and the tomb; cf. *Epic. Drusi* 69 *uix . . . tumuli bene ianua clausa est*, *CIL* XIII 5708 I.9–10 (1st–2nd cent. AD) (easy closing and opening of tomb instructed). The door *into* Hades is always open (Virg. *Aen.* 6.127). 4.10 had begun: . . . *incipiam* (contrast *desine*) . . . *aperire*. In 4.9, after pleas (33–4 *precor*, . . . *pandite*), emotion had burst the door (62).

3–4 present a fuller statement, and move the emphasis further towards Hades, from the grave. *intro* has too lively a sense of motion for *leges* to seem a possible object. *sedes* probably denotes here, not the whole underworld region, but the house or city of Hades, the road from which is not to be travelled (cf. Ov. *Met.* 4.432–45; P. 2.27.13–16).

funera ‘the dead’; cf. *OLD* s.v. 2a and b.

4 The first half of the line has two weighty spondees; the second begins with the strong monosyllable *stant* (cf. 3.2.26), echoed by the strong polysyllable *adamante*. *stant* is ‘are firm with’ (*OLD* s.v. 5b). *adamante*, lit. ‘invincible’, is taken up in *non exorando*. Cf. Hom. *Il.* 9.158: Hades is ἀδάμαστος (i.e. *non exorabilis*, Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.179); Theocr. 3.39 ‘she is not made of adamant’; *SGO* IV 18/01/26.2 (this tomb) ‘Fate made, the work of adamant hand’. Hades’ road is of iron at Alc. Mess. *AP* 7.412.8 (*HE* 89); but the adamant need not be that of the road itself (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 6.552, Ov. *Met.* 4.453: adamant gates of Tartarus). *-ando* (Fruter) fits the context better than ‘never yet’, even if *non exorato* (Ω) could mean that.

5–6 move still more into Hades. *nempe* often presents a fact, known or evident in itself, which is made remarkable by what precedes: Cic. *Tusc.* 3.49 *dicat quamlibet* (sc. *Epicurus uoluptatem*); *nempe eam* . . . (it is still); Ov. *AA* 2.615–16 *hoc quoque, Tr.* 2.260 (even in the *Annales*), *Ex P.* 4.3.38 (Croesus was rich, *nempe tamen* he fell). 5–6 present a paradox: even if Pluto heard (literally), he would be deaf (figuratively); cf. 7. But unlike the concise Afran. 348 Ribbeck *surde audiunt*, 6 softens the paradox by giving the deafness to the underworld. Cf. e.g. *SGO* I 04/08/02.9–12 (1st cent. AD; deaf tomb), Ov. *Am.* 1.8.77 (deaf door); Sen. *HF* 590 *uinci potuit regia carmine* (Orpheus’); deaf gods e.g. P. 2.16.48, 3.24.20. *bibent*, of the sand absorbing the tears (cf. McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 2.11.13–14), also plays ironically on eager listening (Hor. *C.* 2.13.32 *bibit aure*, of the dead). 5 evokes a scene like that of Orpheus (cf. *aulae*), as do 21–6. Cf. Hor. *C.* 1.24.13–18: even if you excelled Orpheus, Quintilius would not live again; Stat. *Theb.* 8.60: Pluto nearly admits an emotional reaction to his literal hearing of Orpheus. Normal sound does not readily pierce the underworld (cf. e.g. Eur. *Or.* 1241; Sil. 12.6590), hence *licet* . . . *audiat*; after even unlikely clauses with *licet* the fut. in the main clause is standard (cf. e.g. Ov. *AA* 2.279–80). If 2 or 4 follows 5, 5 is no less difficult; if 6 follows 1, *litora* is not defined, *surda* is stranger; the location is less explicable.

7–8 Allusion to Orpheus continues, cf. Virg. *G.* 4.502–5 *nec portitor Orci | amplius obiectam passus transire paludem . . . quae numina uoce moueret?* *obserrat . . . lurida porta*

seems likely to be right, *herbosos* . . . *rogos* unlikely. The pallor of death spreads e.g. to *regna* . . . *pallida* (Virg. *Aen.* 8.244–5), *pallentis Auerni* (Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.27). *nigra* in 2 is hardly a problem, especially if the tomb is dwelt on. *obserrat* . . . *porta* would be an easy metonymy: either (1) ‘locks’ (*OLD* s.v. *observo* 1a) or (2) ‘shuts off’ (*OLD* 1b, incl. Flor. 1.41.10 *quasi portā obserrauit*; cf. e.g. Livy 28.6.2 *quam (uia)* . . . *turris* . . . *claudebat*). With (1), one could replace *herbosos* . . . *rogos* by *umbrosas* . . . *fores* (Palmer), cf. 1.16.18 (door) *duris clausa* . . . *foribus*; for *umbrosas lurida* cf. Luc. 6.646–8, or read say *aeternas*. With (2), the obj. could be either *umbrosos* . . . *locos* (Markland) or the upper world, cf. *superos* and 3–4 (say *aetherios* . . . *polos*, cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 7.767–8 *ad sidera rursus | aetheria* . . . *uenisse*, Luc. 8.337).

No compelling grounds have thus appeared for transposition in 1–8 (Goold (1966) 102–4, Butrica (1984) 198–9; against, Heyworth). It would disrupt development of place in 1–6 and neat links in 1–2, 5–6, 5–8.

9 sic . . . **cecineret**: the trumpets’ song (Livy 25.24.5 etc.) is taken as a prophecy (*OLD* s.v. *cano* 8). Cf. 2.7.11: if I married *qualis caneret tibi tibia somnos! sic* refers to 2–4, 7–8, turned into specific statements about C. Trumpets seem to mark a grand funeral, unlike Cynthia’s (Hor. *Sat.* 1.6.43–4; Sen. *Apoc.* 12.1). They accompany the procession (relief from Amiternum, Aquila museum, 1st cent. BC; J. M. C. Toynbee, *Death and burial in the Roman world* (London 1971) pl. 11), and probably accompanied the cremation (Virg. *Aen.* 11.192).

10 detraheret ‘took away’ (*OLD* s.v. *detraho* 1c); *lecto* goes with *subdita* (9). *nostrum* (9) . . . *caput* means ‘me’ (*TLL* s.v. *caput* 404.3–406.29); but it also suggests personhood and civic identity, taken by this enemy from C. (cf. 14 for the paradox).

fax inimica is like a colourful version of the *mors inimica* common in Imperial epitaphs; cf. *CEG* II 495.2 (4th cent. BC): Fate an enemy god.

11–12 3.18.11–12 *quid genus . . . profuit . . . ?* speak similarly of Marcellus; cf. *Epic. Drusi* 41–50, *CIL* VI 6319.5–6; *SGO* 101/15/04.7–8 cf. 3. The voicing here is complex: the lines convey C.’s oblique pride, and her and the author’s flattery of Paullus. They contrast with the poet-narrator, happy to have *nullus . . . antiquo Marte triumphus aui* (2.34.56, cf. 1.5.23–4, 2.14.23–4). Husband, children and *imagines* of ancestors would all have been present at the funeral (9–14; *imagines*: Hor. *Epod.* 8.11–12; H. I. Flower, *Ancestor masks and aristocratic power in Roman culture* (Oxford 1996) ch. 4).

currus auorum: sing. perhaps as the triumphal chariot characteristically theirs, cf. Luc. 9.599–600 *ter Capitolia curru | scandere Pompei*.

pignora tanta: their strong resemblance to Paullus proves the truth of her chaste reputation (cf. *OLD* s.v. *fama* 6a). Cf. *AP* 7.331.3–4: the children ‘a trust-worthy witness to the chastity of my life’. See also 73n.

13–14 C. uses her own name, and that of her *gens*, both proudly and ironically: the pentameter undercuts. (Heyworth suggests metapoetic play in *digitis* (dactyl = finger) and *quinque*, as well as *legatur*.) Her standing worsens the loss of identity seen in *CIL* I² 1732.3–4 *si quaeris qui sim, cinis en et tosta fauilla, | ante obitus tristeis Heluia Prima fui*. (*en* there confirms *en* here, and so confirms P.’s use of epitaph.) Cf. large or beautiful bodies reduced to ash at e.g. *CIL* I² 1222.7–8, Posid. 32.5–6

A–B, Ov. *Met.* 12.615–16 (14.147–9 for reduced *onus*). 14 alludes to Paullus' act at the funeral in picking up the burned remains, as closest mourner; see 4.1.127–8n. The emphasis is not on his love, but on the speaker's reification. This is made the stranger by the animation of 11–14; for *num* cf. Ov. *Her.* 11.17–20, *CIL* vi 6319.5–8.

habuit is so used at e.g. 1.1.8 *aduersos cogor habere deos*.

15–16 C. dramatically turns to face the lower world. *noctes* cannot be right: even 'nights of the damned', if possible, would not make a good pair with *paludes*. Attractive are *nocti* (F. Sandbach, *CQ* 12 (1962) 274–6, cf. Sil. 5.241–2) or *noctis* (Richmond); cf. e.g. Luc. 7.452 *subitis damnauit noctibus Argos. damnatae* then needs a noun. *paludes*, desirable in itself, needs definition, so that *uada lenta*, instead of being a lame expansion, can become an inserted apposition, and *lenta* can stress difficulties of movement (16), cf. Stat. *Sib.* 3.2.67 *lentas transire paludes. quaecumque* (16) too invites a name: if not e.g. the Styx this might be another infernal river (Heyworth's *aut* is wanted). *sedes* . . . *Acherontis* (Butrica) makes two separate replacements; simpler would be *Stygiae* (Hutchinson) for *setuos*: cf. e.g. Virg. *G.* 4.478–80, *Aen.* 6.323 *Stygiamque paludem*. (*Lethes* would also be possible, cf. 4.7.91.) *implico* need not imply entanglement, but does so here; for *unda* cf. Val. Fl. 2.27 *implicuitque uadis* (cf. 28), Stat. *Theb.* 4.821 *implicitos fluuiis*.

17 immatura: common in epitaphs, e.g. *CIL* i² 1295.6–8 *me heice situm immature*; for claims of innocence cf. e.g. *CIL* vi 21846.3–4 (4.7.63 70n.). Both connect with 12–13; but the self-pity is made only incidental to the self-assertion.

18 nec precor (Peerlkamp): *det pater* (ΠΑ) conflicts with the wish in 19–28 for full judgement, with stern Furies and all. *mollia* is a slacker version of *mīis*: cf. Cic. *Ver.* 1.26 *utram . . . putas legem molliorem?* (*mīissima* later). It is highly characteristic of C. to reject what is *mollis* (41). For *iura* of the judgements delivered in Hades, cf. e.g. *CIL* vi 21521.67 (*ML* 183.23) *nec Minos mihi iura dabit, Aetna* 82–3.

hic vigorously takes up *huc* (17); it applies to the whole underworld, not just this spot. *huic* (P, a conjecture) would be more otiose than the adj. at 1.18.13, 2.12.22.

19 at (ς) 'but rather', after a neg., cf. e.g. 1.6.22, 3.24.11.

si shows the same uncertainty as in the living; C. has not reached the court. Some Greek epitaphs ask Aeacus, Minos, Radamanthys for favourable verdicts, e.g. *SEG* 15.876.11–12 (3rd cent. BC?), *IG* xii 6.740.13–14 (2nd cent. BC).

sedet: the sitting position of judges marks their authoritative role, cf. the scenes on triclinium C in the Villa della Farnesina (Rome, Mus. Naz. Rom., Augustan; M. R. Sanzi Di Mino (ed.), *La Villa della Farnesina* (Milan 1989) 48–9).

19–20 urna and *sortila* . . . *pila* probably both extend juries' practice despite the single *iudex* (cf. *RS* 6 for concern with *pilae*, ballots). The urn, usually Minos', seems connected with passing judgement (49, Stat. *Theb.* 11.571–2). Ordering hearings by lot would be too trivial and abnormal; *posita iudex sedet* . . . *urna* would ill suit selecting a jury before the trial. *sortila*, however, cannot be connected with judgement, and denotes a different process (*sortila* . . . *pila* is 'when he has obtained the ballot by lot': for *depon.* perf. participles as pass. see K–S 1111). The judges may, like jurors, be assigned to cases by lot. (Two are assigned by geography in

Plato *Gorg.* 523e6–524a7; in the Cyrene Decree a small panel is chosen by lot, *RDGE* 31.104–12 (4 BC).)

iudicet: the repetition from *iudex* if sound is purposeful: ‘if he sits as judge, let him judge my bones’; cf. Cic. *Ver.* 2.31.

21 assideant: the other sons of Zeus, Rhadamanthys and Minos, act as advisers (*TLL* s.v. *assideo* 879.1 28, Suet. *Tib.* 33 *assidebatque iuxta*, J. A. Crook, *Law and life in Rome* (London 1967) 88; Stat. *Theb.* 8.27–9: *iuxta*, they advise Pluto). It is awkward to have Minos and a brother performing this role for Aeacus and also the Furies performing it for them; *turba* would highlight the disparity. In *assideant fratres, iuxta et* (ς) *Minoida sellam* (ς), the word-order and *assideat* understood with *iuxta* seem unattractive. The *turba* could have a different role with a lacuna after 21 (Heyworth (as a possibility) and Hutchinson). A nom. *Minoida sella* (ΠΑ) would then be easier than *Minoida sellam* after *Aeacus*; it could not then allude to the praetor’s *sella curulis* (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.75.1). *assideat, fratres iuxta et Minoida sellam*, (so Orelli) would be conceivable (cf. 2.9a.25, Virg. *G.* 3.146 for the metre); but we would lose the emphasis on this trial (cf. 19–20).

22 Eumenidum lit. ‘kindly ones’: ironic with *seuera*, as at Virg. *Aen.* 6.374–5. **intento . . . foro** ‘rigorous [*OLD* s.v. *intentus* 2b] court’ (probably).

23–8 are modelled on the spell-binding effect of Orpheus’ and others’ songs in the underworld (Virg. *G.* 4.481 4, Hor. *C.* 2.13.32 40, 3.11.15 24). But, as 24 shows, C. is not bidding all be entranced; she is imperiously or hypothetically calling for the usual and noisy activities to stop, so that she can be heard in complete silence. She swears compensation for this suspension, if she lies: she would become another Danaid, carrying a vessel that can never be filled (27–8).

23–4 The apostrophes are expressive: they heighten C.’s mental contact with these figures, whose existence is often questioned on earth; and they enhance the conception of an oration soon to be delivered (*loquor* in 27 might go further). The same, perhaps archetypal, trio appears at 3.5.42 *num rota, num scopuli, num sitis inter aquas*, Virg. *G.* 3.38–9, *CIL* XIV 510.24–9 (Augustan, in weak Latin). For the sinners in Roman art see B. Andreae, *Studien zur römischen Grabkunst* (Heidelberg 1963) 56–64.

corripere ore: an imitative elision. The wish is not made out of sympathy, like that envisaged at 2.17.5–6, here recalled: *Tantalea mouere . . . sorte, | ut liquor arenti fallat ab ore sitim*.

25–6 The narrator’s wish for Cerberus to frighten Acanthis’ ghost (4.5.3–4) is reversed here, but not from kindness. The constant noise of Cerberus is deplored by a ghost at *CLE* 2121.4. *improbis* indicates fierceness and persistence: cf. Virg. *Aen.* 9.62 (wolf), 10.727 (lion), Sil. 13.293 (Erinyes). To be contrasted are the slighter sufferings that a dog caused the narrator when he was attempting to deceive through love (4.5.73–4).

27 ipsa loquar pro me transforms Cic. *Tusc.* 1.10: before the underworld judges *tibi ipsi pro te erit maximā coronā* (crowd) *causa dicenda*. Romans usually had others speak for them; for speeches *pro se* cf. e.g. *ORF* 21 F 18–22 (Scipio Aemilianus;

a series of at least five), 139 F 5 (jury moved), 162 F 23–8. The words give C. a virile and Scipionic role.

si fallo is a formula of oath; it can relate to a future speech. It particularly takes up 2.20.29–32 (with Aeacus and Sisyphus in the penalty invoked), 4.7.51–4 (Cynthia; less drastic penalties). The threat is closer than in 2.20, the veracity clearer than in 4.7. The phrase takes up too Livy 22.53.11, Scipio's oath for Rome. Cf. also Call. *Ep.* 26.2–4 Pfeiffer (related prayer); Argent. *AP* 7.384.5–8 (*GP* 1473–6). Sisyphus, Ixion, Tantalus, the Danaids, all displayed or suffer deceit (cf. 24); C. links herself with Hypermetra, *sine fraude* (4.7.63n.), and so with Cynthia and her eschatology. The meaning and location of the Danaids in the Palatine complex is too uncertain to illuminate for us their appearance here.

29–32 Forms of praise underlie: funeral speeches commonly began with ancestors (cf. W. Kierdorf, *Laudatio funebris* (Meisenheim 1980) 64–8).

29–30 The heirless Scipio Aemilianus (*cos.* 147) could not be C.'s direct ancestor (App. *BC* 1.83; Syme (1986) 244–7). He destroyed Numantia in Spain (133 BC; App. *Ib.* 322–427 etc., A. E. Astin, *Scipio Aemilianus* (Oxford 1967) chs. 11 and 12). Numantia was later thought a threat comparable to Carthage (Cic. *Mur.* 58, *al.*).

30 is too specific to repeat 29 and give the form 'if anyone has won glory, we have done so' (cf. e.g. Cic. *Fam.* 15.4.13, *Phil.* 9.2). Nor is 'our' (*aera* . . . *nostra* Palmer, *nostra* . . . *signa* Baehrens) plausible of bronze inscriptions or bronze statues. The context and *Numantinos* make the reference in 30 clear without *mihi*; *decor* pointedly, for a woman, does not mean 'beauty', but takes the sense of the pred. dat. *decōri* 'glory' (cf. e.g. *Rhet. Her.* 4.22; *CIL* VIII 7255.b3–4). 29 modestly makes the worth of trophies formally conditional (less formal Virg. *Aen.* 7.4 *si qua est ea gloria*). It glances at scorn for such trappings, cf. Cic. *Pis.* 60, *Rep.* 6.8, Juv. 10.133–7. 30 needs a word for 'trophies': *tropaea* would show this as the sense of *aera*, often applied to arms (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 7.526, *TLL* s.v. *aes* 1073.73–82; or one could read *arma*). For *regna*, one could read say *rapta* (Hutchinson), cf. Virg. *G.* 3.32 *rapta manu* . . . *ex hoste tropaea*, Sil. 1.618–19; this would also hint at the near *spolia opima* which Scipio won earlier in Spain (Val. Max. 3.2.6a–b). The spoils would 'speak of Scipio both figuratively and in their inscriptions.

31 exaequat 'makes equal' (to the Scipiones), cf. e.g. Livy 3.65.11 *aequari uelle simulando* (*sc.* to another), 37.53.9 *ita ut nemo sociorum* . . . *aequari possit* (*sc.* to me). *turba* and *Libones* denote the same people. C. now avoids naming individuals or specifying claims to glory (*OLD* s.v. *titulus* 7). The rich and important Scribonii Libones had far fewer achievements than the Scipiones; C.'s own brother is the first consul, in 34 (*RE* XVIII 881–4, *MRR* III 187). Particularly worthy of note is the *puteal Scribonianum* in the Forum, whatever its exact history (*LTUR* IV 171–3, *MAR* 211–12, *RRC* nos. 416–17; public building in Rome and Campania: Pliny *NH* 36.102, *ILLRP* 567–8).

32 est . . . **fulta** 'is held up', despite the perf. form (cf. e.g. Cic. *Balb.* 35). It plays on the literal support of buildings by numerous pillars (e.g. 3.2.11 *domus*, Juv. 7.182–3). Cf. 69 *serie fulcite genus*.

33 mox: C. has elaborately indicated the two lines of her family of birth; then she joined Paullus' family (35). *mox* marks the next stage, as of women's successive marriages at Luc. 2.330, Tac. *Hist.* 2.64.1. *iam* underlines the new stage of life, cf. Virg. *Ecl.* 4.37. If explicit narrative were required before 33, it would be better to mark a lacuna than transpose 43–4 there (Peerlkamp); *magnae . . . domus* would puzzle after the two *domus* of 29–32, and a girl before marriage seems an unlikely *pars imitanda domus*.

33–4 Wedding details appear matter-of-factly; Arethusa's lamentation is to be contrasted (4.3.13–16). Transition from girlhood is stressed through costume: cf. [Quint.] *Decl. Min.* 349.6 *uirginis praetextam* (a child's toga), Val. Fl. 8.6 *uirginis . . . uittis* (not yet the bridal and maternal *uittae*); 4.3.13–16n., J. L. Sebesta in Sebesta and Bonfante (1994) 46–9. *acceptas . . . comas* adapts the phrase 'taking hair' (Plaut. *Most.* 226 *capiundas crinis*): brides' hair was parted with a spear and elaborately treated. Cf. L. La Follette in Sebesta and Bonfante (1994) 56–61. *acceptas* also plays on acceptance into marriage: cf. e.g. Ov. *Her.* 4.121 *laedaque accepta iugali*.

35–6 C., arriving at her marriage, addresses Paullus. Thus the form of the imagined oration is entangled with that of her communication with him, as it is entangled with the physical form of the epitaph. *hoc* surprises readers; *legar* intimates their reading. The unusual interlacing (*ut* takes up *sic*) perhaps suits the unbroken union.

Inscriptions often present a dead wife as *uniuir(ita)*, *uno contenta uiro* etc.; cf. e.g. *CIL* vi 2318.10, 5162, 19838.3–5 (explicitly seen as showing chastity, cf. Val. Max. 2.1.3, Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.55–6), x 3058.7–8, *IG* xiv 1526.3–4 (Rome). The narrator distorts such praise for his own epitaph at 2.13.36 *unius . . . seruis amoris*; he and C. are connected here, contrasted as regards ancestors (11n., cf. 2.13.9–10). The inscriptions are praising a striking feature, perceived as rare: cf. Cat. 111.1 2, *CIL* vi 41062 I.27, Livy 10.23.4–5, 9–10 (with a decline). See also M. Humbert, *Le remariage à Rome* (Milan 1972) 59–75.

37–44 C. takes up her ancestors in 37–8 (cf. 29–32), Paullus' in 39–40 (cf. 35–6), to show that she has not damaged her conjugal or parental house and reputation. It is better not to interrupt this cohesive self-defence with 65–6, which Heyworth puts before 37.

37 testor: C. calls the two Scipiones Africani to witness as if they were gods; cf. Cic. *Rab. Perd.* 30 for the same rhetorical move with Marius and others. *cineres . . . colendos* sharpens the paradox of apotheosis; 101–2 are prepared. Thoughts of the Elder Africanus in particular often tended upwards: cf. Livy 26.19.2, 9, Sen. *Ep.* 86.1.

38 Africa (Carthage) is contrasted with Rome by the apostrophe, and with the Scipios, also 'dead', by *colendos* (37) and *iaces*. A metaphorical tomb of Carthage is evoked, strikingly in this poem, with the Scipios' deeds written above the dead instead of the grave-inscription. Cf. *CIL* vi 37412.1–2 *sub hoc titulo . . . ossa; . . . iacet*; Hor. *Epod.* 9.25–6 *Africanum, cui super Carthaginem | uirtus sepulcrum condidit* (cf.

Watson ad loc.); *Culex* 370–1 Carthage's walls *deuota triumphis* of the Scipios (both, cf. Man. 1.792 *fatum Carthaginis unum*). *tunsa* means *contusa*; *contundo* is often used of crushing defeat (*OLD* s.v. 3a).

39–40 Aemilius Paullus (*cos.* 182) ended the Macedonian kingdom by defeating Perseus in 168 (N. G. L. Hammond and F. W. Walbank, *A History of Macedonia* III (Oxford 1988) chs. 23–6). This victory retained its resonance: cf. the *elogia* II XIII 3 nos. 71, 81; Virg. *Aen.* 6.838–40 (839 (Perseus) *genus arripotentis Achilli*). *maiorum* is not readily extended beyond 38: the main link will be with Paullus, though Aemilius is a notional ancestor of them both. On *RRC* no. 415 Paullus' father celebrates Aemilius' victory. Paullus' tradition and house (40, cf. 42, 44) defeat Perseus'. Perseus was actually more interested in the heroes Perseus and Heracles: cf. P. Stirpe, *RIFC* 130 (2002) 1–20.

The text cannot be recovered in detail. Deflating repetition in 40 of *proau-* . . . *Achill-* would be more like Ovid; *Perseus* cannot be the next object of *testor*; *proauo* . . . *Achille* lacks a construction. There may be relevance in Sil. 14.93–5 (Achilles stimulates Hieronymus), 15.292 *proauoque tumebat Achille* (Perseus' father). Cf. J. R. Hamilton, *CQ* 51 (1957) 134–7, Goold (1966) 86–7, A. Finkenauer, *RhM* 144 (2001) 147–59.

41–4 The relation of public and family history has been apparent in 29–32, 37–40; here close moral relations are envisaged between individual, family and state. Vell. 2.95.3 depicts Paullus' colleague, L. Munatius Plancus, as incapacitated for the censorship by his private past: a contrast with C. here is plausible. Conversely, Ov. *F.* 6.637–48 praises Augustus (and with him Livia) for demolishing a luxurious house: *sic agitur censura et sic exempla parantur. erubuisse* (42), though of Paullus' family, recalls Livy 38.59.11: the punishment of a Scipio would be *erubescendum* (end of speech) to Rome as much as to the Cornelii. This, like *exuuiis tantis*, points to the public dimension of C.'s families. The idea of both following and creating tradition is integral to Augustus' approach, on a public and a private level: cf. Aug. *RG* 8.5 [*exe*] *mpla imitanda pos[teris tradidi]* (in the Greek, 'I passed myself on to be imitated'; Dio 54.16.3–6 shows more awkward tensions). In Hor. *C.* 3.6.17–44 female adultery affects the state, even in potential for war.

41 censurae legem is based on the *lex censui censendo* (Livy 43.14.5, cf. *RS* 24.147 8) announced by the censors as their basis for revising the list of citizens. Paullus and Plancus may not have got this far: their tenure was decided to be a failure (Vell. 2.95.3, contrast Livy 40.51.1; Dio 54.2.1–3). In 22 BC (*II* XIII 1.58–9, 137–8) Augustus preferred to give others the actual office; he generally performed many of its functions (*II* XIII 1.254.60, Aug. *RG* 6, 8, Ov. *l.c.*, Suet. *Aug.* 27.5, Dio 52.42, 54.2.3, 13–14, 16.6). It remains a great honour, neatly brought in here; cf. *ILS* 886.2, Suet. *Aug.* 64.1. See also T. H. Watkins, *L. Munatius Plancus* (*JCS* Suppl. 7, 1997) 141.

mollisse 'soften the effect of', cf. *OLD* s.v. 6–8; nothing *mollis* would suit C., who is no figure of love-elegy. The negation on her conduct contrasts with Cynthia's *assertion* of fidelity to her lover, *me seruasse fidem* (4.7.53).

43–4 The third person, the negation, *pars* all express pride with feminine austerity. Cf. e.g. *CIL* 1² 15, where a male Scipio (*pr.* 139 BC) is made to boast of what he has done for his delighted house.

45 *nec mea mutata est aetas* 'nor did I change during my life' (*OLD* s.v. *aetas* 5a). C. is thinking primarily of deterioration during her marriage (46); *crimine* here refers to adultery, cf. *Ov. Her.* 4.31–3, 17.17–18 (*uixi* 17), *Sil.* 6.438–42, *AE* 2000 no. 1773.2–4. The short years of guarded girlhood hardly come into consideration. *mutata est* glances at P.'s language for lovers' fidelity, esp. 2.24*b*.33 *me non aetas mutabit tota Sibyllae*. Cf. *CIL* VI 10230.14–18 (Augustan) on sustaining marriages and on praise *consensu ciuium* (cf. *insignes* 46).

46 *uiximus*: often with praise or self-praise in epitaphs, e.g. *CIL* 1² 1206.2 *femina opituma uixit*, 1217.6–7 (with explicit pathos, as frequently), 1218.7 *uixi quom fide*.

inter utramque facem: the reference to C.'s death, taking up the marriage-torch of 33, is allusive and restrained. Contrast the pathos at *Sen. Rh. Con.* 6.6 *subiectae rogo felices faces* (cf. Meleager *AP* 7.182.7–8 (*HE* 4686–7)), *CIL* IX 6315.4 *faxis altera morti*[s] (cf. *Antip. Thess. AP* 7.185.5 (*GP* 161)).

47–8 *mi* is emphatically placed. Despite *legem* 41 and *crimine* 45, laws and trials are irrelevant to C. This law is not implanted in all, as *sanguine* shows: C.'s character and lineage ensure her virtue. Cf. 2.22*a*.17–18 *uni cuique dedit uitium natura creato; | mi . . . , 3.9.20 naturae sequitur semina quisque suae*, *CIL* VI 10230.21–2 (of the good woman) *naturalia bona propria custodiā seruata*. 48 should not use *nec* (ς) to join a generalization (like that at *Ov. Am.* 3.4.29) to this statement about C. *possem* (ς) would not lucidly refer to the past (cf. 4.6.65*n*.). Perhaps *non* (Hutchinson) for *ne* (ΠΛ). C. implies lofty superiority to two courts in particular: the new *quaestio* of Augustus, which began public trials for adultery (McGinn (1998) 141–2); and the very court to which she is envisaging her defence (cf. 19–20, with sing. *iudex*, and 49).

a sanguine ductas goes beyond learning (44) to a primal absorption, as of a liquid (*OLD* s.v. *duco* 25*b*). Cf. *Cic. Mil.* 10 *lex, quam non didicimus . . . uerum ex natura ipsa . . . hausimus*; *Livy* 9.17.10: *indoles* of great men distinct from tradition *per manus*.

49–50 *ferat* and *erit* make clear the reference to the posthumous trial; *urna* takes up 19. C.'s primary meaning must be that however severe the judge's standards, she is in any case pure; he is thus morally irrelevant (cf. 48). *assessu* may glance at support in the trial (*OLD* s.v. *assideo* 1*b*) – though the presence there of the earlier dead would be unexpected; but the main reference is to friendly talks with her equals in the Elysian fields, cf. 4.7.63–70, tomb painting from via Portuense, Rome, *Mus. Naz. Rom.* (2nd cent. AD), I. Baldassare et al., *Pittura romana* (Milan 2002) 315. For *assessu* cf. e.g. 4.3.41, *Cic. Rep.* 1.17, *Mart.* 2.41.19–20, *Apul. Met.* 4.24.2. Such talks imply a positive verdict. *austeras*, not naturally used of a vote or 'voting tablets' (*tabellas*), really describes the judge (cf. e.g. 3.14.24 *austeri poena . . .*

uir). But the irrelevance of the trial is heightened by the hinted idea that even condemnation would prove nothing.

ferat: for the subj. cf. e.g. Ov. *AA* 1.599 *quidquid facias . . . proteruius aequo*; the act of casting the votes (*OLD* s.v. *fero* 27a) is transferred from the judge to the voting-urn (cf. Sen. Rh. *Con.* 7.8.7 *iudex . . . tulit de reo tabellam*).

turpior: for such pollution cf. 4.8.83–6n. (Cynthia shuns it); Pliny *Ep.* 4.11.9.

51–2 Claudia was prominent in the bringing to land of Cybele, transported from Asia (204 BC). 51 recalls the story that Claudia moved the stuck ship and so gave divine proof of her doubted chastity: cf. Ov. *F.* 4.291–348 (326 stage-play), *Ex P.* 1.2.141–2, Sil. 17.8–47; altar 1st cent. AD, Rome, Mus. Cap. inv. 321 (Beard, North and Price (1998) II 45–6). Livy 29.14.12 *traditur* indicates that the idea of a dubious reputation is pre-Augustan. The version brings out, like 53–4, the independence of conscious virtue from opinion (in App. *Hann.* 234 Claudia faces a trial for adultery). But relevant from other accounts is Claudia's pairing with a Scipio in the task. He is thought the best man, she the chastest matron: cf. Cic. *Har.* 27, where as at *Cael.* 34 the modern Clodia is contrasted.

The scene of Roman virtue strikingly includes the import of a foreign deity (cf. 4.1.17). Her towered headdress shows her many cities; cf. Virg. *Aen.* 6.785 *inuehitur . . . Phrygias turrata per urbes* – in a comparison with Rome.

tu: as at 23–4, there is point in an apostrophe from the dead C. to these women still present in Hades. *rara* invites comparison with the narrator on Cynthia (esp. 1.8.42).

53–4 At D.H. *Ant.* 2.68.3–5 a mature Vestal Aemilia (Paullus' *gens*) faces death for unchastity: the fire has gone out through her. Praying to Vesta, she lays part of her cotton robe on the altar; fire blazes through it. Val. Max. 1.1.7 has a slightly different version. In P., Vesta's demanding the fire (*OLD* s.v. *reposco* 2a) increases Aemilia's solitude. The relatively involved structure (cf. 3.18.5–6) heightens the tension.

At 4.1.21–2 Vesta contrasts with foreign gods (51–2 n.); she embodies perpetual tradition. Reversal of 4.4.45–6 undoes suppositions of decline: there the actually sinful Vestal imagines extinguishing the fire with amorous tears. Aemilia's date is not primeval: *carbasus* (< κάρπασος, cf. Skt. *karpāsah?*) was ascribed to Spain (Pliny *NH* 19.10), or the East (cf. P. 4.3.64), and is integral to the story, not merely poetic language. Cf. Horsfall on Virg. *Aen.* 11.776.

55–60 Before wedding Octavian, Scribonia was married *duobus consularibus, ex altero etiam matrem*: so Suet. *Aug.* 62.2 (another husband is not impossible). C. was one child, the *Corneli Marcellini* of *CIL* VI 26033.4 another. The identity of the husbands is problematic (J. Scheid, *BCH* 100 (1976) 485–91, Syme 247–53). Octavian married Scribonia in 40 BC, for political reasons (App. *BC* 5.222, Dio 48.16.3; B. Severy, *Augustus and the family at the birth of the Roman Empire* (New York 2003) 63). She bore him Julia in 39 BC (*nata* 59); he divorced her at once to marry Livia, with whom he was having an affair (Suet. *Aug.* 62.2, 69.1, *Claud.* 1.1,

Dio 48.34.3). Augustus' claim (*Hist. fr.* 14 Malcovati) to have divorced Scribonia *pertaesus morum peruersitatem eius* is a reply to Antonian polemic (Suet. *Aug.* 69.1; cf. Sen. *Ep.* 70.10); we cannot infer ironies about her in 56. Augustus' continuing involvement with Scribonia's family is notable; cf. Cic. *Att.* 7.1.8, 9.11.3 for Cicero's varied relations with his daughter's former husband. Scribonia continued the appellation *Scribonia Caesaris* (*CIL* VI 26033.3, 31276).

55 dulce caput: Dido says *tuumque | dulce caput* to her sister (Virg. *Aen.* 4.492–3; *caput* voc. at e.g. P. 2.1.36). C. would not use such affectionate language to her husband, though even the dead Creusa does (Virg. *Aen.* 2.777 *o dulcis coniunx*; cf. H. S. Nielsen in B. Rawson and P. Weaver (edd.), *The Roman family in Italy* (Oxford 1997) 185–93). The apostrophe to the living follows 51–4 to the dead. *ne te . . . laesi* evokes third-person epitaphs, cf. esp. *CIL* IX 5629.4–5 (presumably Republican) *quae nunquam laesit matre[m]*. Here the praise becomes evidence for the defence.

56 Cf. the more forthright male Aeneas, Virg. *Aen.* 12.435–6 *disce, puer, uirtutem ex me . . . , | fortunam ex aliis*. Fate of course cannot be changed; cf. e.g. *CIL* VI 12652.116–17.

57–8 Assertion of lamentation received, common in epitaphs, is forcibly turned to legal argument. Alliteration stresses the combination *laudor lacrimis*; *defensa* is paradoxically joined with the inarticulate *gemitu*. Caesar partly matches the private *maternis*, but also forms a public climax that goes beyond *urbis*. His own law *de iudiciis publicis* (c. 17 BC) might be played on; this certainly prevented compulsion to witness against some relatives by marriage (*RDGE* 31.116–18, *Dig.* 22.5.4 *pr.*), and so may have mentioned bearing witness for them. For the city's grief cf. e.g. *CIL* I² 1924.5–6 . . . *populus . . . magno . . . fletu funus prosecutus est*, Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.221.

59 The concept 'sister' covered a wider range than in modern English. *dignam* neatly honours C., Julia and Augustus; cf. Ov. *F.* 6.810 (an Atia) *o sacra femina digna domo!* Julia (55–60n.) had by 17 BC borne to Agrippa Augustus' prospective heirs C. and L. Caesar; her head appears between theirs on the reverse of *RIC*² Aug. 404–5 (13 BC).

60 Rome's poetic, and cultic, practice advances gradually in assimilating the living Augustus to deity (cf. Beard, North and Price (1998) 1206–8). So Ovid from AD 8 e.g. *Tr.* 1.2.4 (*deo*), Man. 1.9 (*deus*; after AD 9). The direct *deo* here is unusually early (3.4.1 *deus Caesar* is direct, but undercut by 3.5.1; less direct e.g. Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.15–17; P. 2.15.48 *deos* makes a possible allusion). *deo* has been prepared by the superimpositions of divinity in 4.9.13, 32 (Heracles), 10.11 (Romulus). It is made paradoxical by the blame (of the gods), and the flowing tears (*OLD* s.v. *eo* 3b): gods were not meant to weep (Ov. *F.* 4.521–2 etc.; imitation: *Epic. Drusi* 466).

uidimus presses on the problems of perception in the dead.

61–2 Despite the grief felt by Augustus (*et tamen*), C. has at least had three children (63–4, 67–8) – fulfilment for a woman, and also something promoted in Augustus' legislation of c. 18. Cf. P. A. Brunt, *Italian manpower*, 2nd edn. (Oxford 1987) 558–66; Hor. *Saec.* 17–20; Gai. *Inst.* 1.145, 194 (three a crucial number for

women too). The senatorial class was especially important. C. has earned her *stola*: the garment of *matronae*, married women of the upper class particularly (cf. *generosos*). Cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.70–1 (a *cunnum* born from a consul *uelatumque stola*), Pliny *NH* 33.40 *inter stolam plebemque*; Livy 10.23.4, 10. There is not adequate evidence of a special *stola* as reward for three children (E. Hübner in *Commentationes philologicae in honorem Theodori Mommsen* (Berlin 1877) 104–10); nor is *generosus* ‘fertile’. The connection of 61–2 with 59–60 should not be interrupted by inserting 65–6 before 61 (Koppiers); and the repeated *uidimus* would be unwelcome.

rapio/eripio/ἄρπάζω abound in epitaphs; *rapina de domo* gives an unusual image.

63–4 The two sons were M. Aemilius Lepidus (*cos.* AD 6) and L. Aemilius Paullus (*cos.* AD 1). See R. Syme, *Roman Papers* VI (Oxford 1991) 252 (arguing Marcus is the older), 261–2; R. D. Weigel, *RhM* 128 (1985) 180–91. Lucius was to marry Augustus’ granddaughter Julia; cf. *CIL* VI 40320 (3 *Augusti progener* Alföldy).

leuamen, an uncommon word in poetry hitherto, links specifically with Virg. *Aen.* 3.709–10. There Anchises dies; he had been to his son *omnis curae casusque leuamen*. The transference of such solace *post fata* creates a more surprising idea.

manu (Scaliger): a dead or dying body can be held in the *sinus* (Virg. *Aen.* 4.686, *Epic. Drusi* 95–6); but the ‘you’ plural makes the single action in *uestro* . . . *sinu* (Λ) harder to imagine. The hand is usual with such phrases (see Heyworth): cf. Ov. *AA* 3.742 *lumina conde manu*, Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.196 *cara pressit sua lumina dextra*. The reader is to infer that Paullus was absent; from the first the death causes changes in family roles (cf. 75).

[65–6] flagrantly interrupt the sequence on the children and the closely-knit pair of couplets 63–4, 67–8. Since there is no satisfactory location for 65–6 in the poem (37–44, 62–3nn.), they are presumably a relatively early interpolation, filling in historical details. The *Epiciedion Drusi*, written after AD 6 (cf. 283–8), not around Drusus’ death in 9 BC, illustrates an interest in reconstructing past events. The lines contain nothing clearly damning. But it is hard to restore 66 into any elegant form. *sellam geminasse curulem* (gained two curule magistracies) rather oddly puts praetorship and the far more prestigious consulship on a level; contrast Ov. *Ex P.* 3.4.99 *geminabit honorem* of a second triumph. If the lines are spurious, we have no Propertian evidence on C.’s brother or her date of death. The writer may have supposed this brother to be either P. Cornelius Scipio (*cos.* 16) or P. Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus (*cos.* 18); the latter is more plausible historically (cf. *CIL* VI 26033.4–5, J. Scheid, *BCH* 100 (1976) 485–91; otherwise Syme (1986) 250–2).

67–8 Little is known of the daughter; she has been somewhat tenuously conjectured as the wife of L. Lentulus (*cos.* 3 BC): cf. J. Scheid, *BCH* 100 (1976) 491, Syme (1986) 252–3, 297. She was not necessarily born in 22: *specimen censurae nata* is ‘born to be the test of the censorship’ – will she show that he has brought her up with sound morals? See Heubner on Tac. *Hist.* 2.64.1 (this deed was the first *specimen* of the new principate). Cf. 41 (the same burden rested on her mother); Julia is later seen as the antithesis of her father’s marital legislation (Sen. *Ben.*

6.32.1). The injunction to have a single husband shows pressure from the mother too: 44 is seen in practice. *teneas* means making the husband want to stay with her; as at *CIL* VI 10230.15 *matrimonia opsequio probitate retineret*, *Juv.* 2.138 *partu retinere maritos*; cf. *Ov. AA* 2.103; *Medea tenuisset Jason (retinendae* 295). 67, and the distinct 69, imply that *probitas* is the favoured means.

69–70 After addressing sons and daughter, and instructing the daughter, C. can now instruct them all. *CIL* I² 15.6 *progeniem genui*, a male Scipio proclaims; and now the family was dying out (Syme (1968) ch. 18). *fulcite* picks up 32; cf. *Eur. IT* 57 (male children pillars of houses).

mihi cumba uolenti | soluitur ‘I am happy for Charon’s boat to set off’ (cf. *OLD* s.v. *solio* 4b; *uolenti* as *Livy* 38.15.5).

tot . . . meis are the three children, hyperbolically, and secondarily their postulated progeny too. The fut. *uncturis* (LPΛ) is hardly apt, especially with *cumba . . . soluitur*; *aucturis* (Σ) *mea fata* is not easily understood as ‘will bring me glory, being dead’ or ‘extend my span’. As for *facta* (Σ), *triumphi* and *emeritum* suggest achievement. *aucturis . . . mea facta* ‘increasing my deeds (by their own)’ seems possible; this is a more probable sense at *Tib.* 1.7.55–6 *proles, quae facta parentis | augeat et circa stet ueneranda senem* than ‘enhancing’ or ‘praising’ (cf. Murgatroyd ad loc.). *mea facta* remains slightly surprising for chastity and childbearing; one might consider *benefacta* (Hutchinson), a word which spans service (as 1.1.16) to the family and deeds worthy of triumphs (as 2.1.24). (*bene* might have caused *malis* (ΠΛ).) Cf. further e.g. *CIL* VI 36629.5–6 *quibus bene feci dicne* (i.e. *digne*), *Sal. Hist.* 1.77.6 *gentis Aemiliae benefacta. mihi* (emphatic) . . . *meis* would make the reference to C. clear.

71–2 ‘A woman’s triumph, her final reward, is when unbiased reputation praises the completed service of her bed.’ The language takes up 70, including *tot*: conceiving children has been her particular service. Cf. 61–2, and the ironic *Ov. Her.* 4.127 *i nunc, sic meriti lectum reuerere parentis* (he has produced sons to displace you). *emeritum* plays on military service, following *triumphi*; cf. *Plaut. Bac.* 43 (soldier’s prostitute). For *libera fama* cf. *Ov. Met.* 15.853–4. The *merces* consists of the triumph: cf. 3.4.3 *magna, uiri, merces: . . . triumphos*, *Val. Max.* 2.7.1 *merces speciosissimus Scipionis triumphus exstitit*. Triumphs in book 4 form a sequence: at 3.68 literal, at 6.65–6 literal, over a woman (cf. 6.22), at 8.17–18 by a woman, figurative but physical. Here C. is not registering the limits of female glory (cf. e.g. *CIL* VI 10230.20–6 for limited grounds) but asserting parallelism with her male ancestors (11 etc.). The triumph is non-physical but glances at the funeral procession (cf. *Sen. Marc.* 3.1, of Drusus). ‘Greatest’ would be a doubtful sense for *extrema*.

73–4 slip back, from the advice of 67–9, into addressing Paullus. Butrica’s explicit *Paulle* for *natos* is excluded by imitations at *Ov. F.* 3.775–6 *sua pignora, natos*, | *commendant* and *Alc. Barc.* 95 *commendo tibi pia pignora, natos* (papyrus 4th cent. AD – early for such a gloss in P). *nunc* turns to action; cf. 3.21.11. The dead can commend children to the husband in epitaph: cf. e.g. *CEG* II 530.4 (4th cent. BC);

AE 2000 no. 1773.6–8. The moment also recalls: Cynthia's *mandata* (4.7.71–86); last injunctions (cf. *Eur. Alc.* 375–8; [Quint.] *Decl. Mai.* 6.6); wills (cf. e.g. *Cic. Fin.* 3.9), where individuals can be addressed (cf. e.g. *Dig.* 32.40.1, 41 *pr.*). Dead and living utterance come close.

pignora means both signs of their union and an obligation; cf., with *communis*, *Ov. Met.* 5.523–4, [Quint.] *Decl. Mai.* 6.8, 8.6, 7, and in general *OLD* s.v. *pignus* 6a (of children). Obligation matters more for C.'s persuasion (cf. *Eur. Alc.* 302–3). Love for Paullus is implied; but e.g. *CIL* III 9610.7–8 *longi pignus amoris* is more direct. C. uses far stronger language on the children. 74 is based on *Cic. Ver.* 1.113 (legacy to daughter annulled, 104–5) *cur hunc dolorem cineri eius atque ossibus inussisti? haec cura*, a more unusual object of *inuro*, recalls the narrator's love remaining in death (1.19.5–6, 12, 19–20); cf. the etymology of *cura* from *cor urere* (Varro *LL* 6.46, Maltby (1991) s.v.). If not as cruel as Aeneas' *hic amor* to Dido (*Aen.* 4.346), C.'s *haec cura* to Paullus shows the harshness of her austerity.

75 Alcestis' 'be a mother to these children instead of me' (*Eur. Alc.* 377) follows a passionate tradition in which deaths impose a figurative realignment of roles (Hom. *Il.* 6.429–30, Aesch. *Cho.* 238–43a; cf. *P.* 2.18.33–4). C.'s more sober language adapts the terms of formal deputizing (cf. e.g. *Livy* 1.41.6, *Dig.* 41.3.15 *pr.*), like *Pliny Ep.* 6.6.6 (for friend's brother). On difference in the mother's and father's roles cf. *Sen. Prov.* 2.5–6, [Quint.] *Decl. Mai.* 8.7–8; S. Dixon, *The Roman mother* (London 1988) 129–35. Marcus (63–4n.) must have been at least nine in 18 BC to be thirty-three (normal minimum age for consulship) by AD 6.

76 The neck is often used where English would say 'shoulders' (e.g. *Ov. F.* 4.185 *cervice feretur*). A child's embrace is also glanced at. Cf. *Virg. G.* 2.523, *Ov. Met.* 1.485; *F.* 2.760 (wife) *de . . . collo dulce pependit onus*. For *turba* cf. *Tib.* 2.2.22.

77–8 Parallelism with 75–6 drives in the point: | *tota . . . tuum* | takes up | *omnis . . . tuo* |; *matris* | . . . *tuum* | takes up *meorum* | . . . *tuo* |. There is a poignant distance in the change from *meorum* to the third-person *matris* when the description of the embrace becomes more direct. For kisses of children on another's behalf cf. *Fronto M. Caes.* 5.48.2, 5.57.2 *meo nomine*. The change to *tota domus* goes beyond the suggested weight of the children to evoke the massive physical house, and Paullus' lineage: cf. 32 *domus . . . fulta*, *Cat.* 68b.94 *tecum una tota est nostra sepulta domus*; *Sen. NQ* 6.1.9 (literal *domus . . . onus*, paradoxically minimized).

79–80 His kisses were to comfort (77: cf. e.g. *Virg. Aen.* 1.228, 256); their kisses on first seeing their father (cf. e.g. *Lucr.* 3.894–6) must touch deceptively dry cheeks. Aemilius Paullus' public lack of tears when bereaved moved his audience (*Livy* 45.42.1); the reader is moved by his descendant's domestic restraint. Within the domestic world, different levels of privacy and intimacy open. Relevant are the concealed and secluded tears of the *Odyssey* (e.g. 17.304; 21.350–8 – which link also with 78 here).

The now standard punctuation *eris, sine . . . illis!* (or *illis*;) requires an imperative to be understood from a fut.; contrast 3.21.33 *seu moriar, fato* (sc. *moriar*, but read *sic moriar fato*?). *sine testibus illis* is not pithy or proverbial like *manum de tabula!* (*Cic.*

Fam. 7.25.1 etc.). *eris sine* further enables *etsi* (Hutchinson), not the inappropriate *et*; the ‘even’ would relate to 80, not the probability of the mourning, cf. e.g. 2.19.1, *Ov. Ad* 1.151. The clause remains false modesty, cf. 1, 6; *quid* is an internal acc. (‘at all’). *tu si* would also be possible.

81–2 Devoted weeping, implied in Paullus, continues day and night: so *Hom. Il.* 24.744–5, *CIL* VI 21521.b9–10 (*ML* 183.25–6). (For a husband cf. *CIL* VI 24049.5–6 with [Quint.] *Decl. Mai.* 6.4.) Virgil’s *noctemque diemque fatigant* (*Aen.* 8.94) is halved. For *de* cf. 2.20.3 *quidue mea de fraude deos . . . fatigas?*; speech, and consciousness, are suggested. So *somnia* does not form a good second obj. of *fatiges*, especially since *quas* should be ‘enough for you to wear out’, not an added command. *saepe* has no syntactic role; *credita* does not relate, as expected, to *in faciem. reddita* (Graevius) is desirable, and perhaps *quaere* (Hutchinson; cf. 4.4.65 *de te mihi somnia quaeram*, *CIL* VI 18817.12–14). The likeness to C. recalls 4.7.7–8; but here reality and C.’s intent (cf. *Eur. Alc.* 354–6) are left open.

Paulle, unneeded for sense, is placed next to *me* (cf. 1), in a moment of closeness.

83–4 C. urges Paullus to intense communion with her image, whether statue (cf. *Eur. Alc.* 348–54, *Stat. Silv.* 2.7.128–31) or small portrait (cf. *Ov. Ex P.* 2.8.57 (*simulacra*), 65–74). But any reply will be purely in Paullus’ hopes or pretence: cf. *Ov. Her.* 13.158 *tamquam possit uerba referre queror* (Laodamia and statue), *Sil.* 8.94 *sperat responsa remitti* (Dido and image); *Livy* 25.38.8 *uelut si adhortantes . . . uideatis eos* (in thought). That communication interacts with the present communication, also ultimately unreal.

secreto ‘privately’ (*OLD* s.v. *secreto* 3a).

singula uerba ‘every single word’: cf. Maltby on *Tib.* 2.1.32.

85–6 seu here and in 91 form a pair of possibilities; cf. *OLD* s.v. *siue* 3. *tamen* contrasts the first condition with the devotion and singleness imagined in 75–84. The ordering and the glide to new addressees (first 87, but cf. *nouerca*) enhance the surprise, and C.’s noble practicality. This is set against Cynthia’s bitter reproaches and Alcestis’ impassioned request against remarriage, for her children’s sake (*Eur. Alc.* 299–325, cf. 326–35, 1087–93, 1096). With similarly moving practicality the childless wife suggests divorce, *CIL* VI 41062 II.43–50; cf. also the restraint of Aemilia, wife of the Elder Scipio (*Val. Max.* 6.7.1).

The symbolic marriage-bed, placed in the atrium opposite the front door, is the wife’s (*nostro*, cf. *Ascon. Mil.* p. 43 Clark *lectulum aduersum uxoris*; [Quint.] *Decl. Mai.* 6.16). It would be newly laid for a new bride (*Cic. Clu.* 14; cf. *P.* 4.8.87); the wife could also sit on it, as a couch (*Laber.* 30 Ribbeck, 42 Bonaria). For *cauta* cf. *Germ.* 546 *numquam securo* (Juno), though one would expect a more specific danger.

87 coniugium means principally Paullus’ marriage to this particular woman, but also remarriage as such (cf. 91) and the woman herself (cf. 89, 3.13.19–20, *OLD* s.v. *coniugium* 3a). *laudate* denotes polite approbation, *ferte* practical acceptance. Cf.

Cic. *Att.* 14.17.3 (son says he *Aquiliam nouercam non esse laturum*); Xen. *Cyr.* 8.5.20 (match 'praised', though not finally decided on), Eur. *Alc.* 1093 (refusal to remarry 'praised', though thought misguided – a significant intertext), e.g. Livy 9.12.1 (*laudo* 'approve').

88 Capture and surrender lose their amatory associations; contrast esp. 4.8.63–82. Even for women, *mores* are an unerotic route to gaining affection, cf. Lucr. 4.1280–2, Phaed. 3.8.16 (P. 3.6.25 is barbed); *CIL* xi 6246.5 (slave-boy). Behind literary stereotypes of stepmothers may lie a belief that they lack maternal feeling (cf. e.g. Calp. Flac. 35). See also P. A. Watson, *Ancient stepmothers* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 143, 1995) chs. 4–5.

89–90, coming after 88, show the fragility of any accord. *laudate* and *libera* point a contrast with 71–2, where C. exults in open praise. The tactful admonition comes strikingly within a poem of which the overt aim must be to praise C. (cf. e.g. Augustus' poetry of praise on Drusus' tomb, Suet. *Claud.* 1.5, and the explicit purpose of praise in *CIL* vi 10230.20–30; 41062 II.67–8 (inscribed oration)). C.'s shrewd observation contrasts with the bitterness of Cynthia at her successor's jealousy (cf. esp. 4.7.41–2). Yet *uertet in offensas* . . . *suas* ('against her', cf. Ov. *Tr.* 2.134) lays the blame with the stepmother, and implies, abnormally, that without intention a verbal *offensa* is not real. *nimis* is better taken with *laudate* than with *collata* (as by Heyworth): a modicum of acceptable praise is more easily imagined than a modicum of acceptable comparison. Too much praise is a familiar risk (cf. e.g. Pind. *Ol.* 2.95–8). Succession is naturally accompanied by ranking: cf. Ov. *Met.* 15.852–4 (*libera*, of uninhibited ranking), Tac. *Ann.* 1.10.7, 76.4.

91–2 An ardent renunciation like Admetus' is hypothetically imagined for Paullus (Eur. *Alc.* 328–31). Cf. *CIL* vi 14404.7–8 (*CLE* 1038 for punctuation): you have become ashes in a tiny tomb, but *diceris coniunx una fuisse uiri* (cf. Eur. *Alc.* 329–30), and probably *CIL* i² 1221.a8–10; Carphyll. *AP* 7.260.3–4 (*HE* 1351–2). *contentus* intimates that such gestures are more obviously female (cf. e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 4.28–9, 552 *fides cineri promissa Sychaeo*, *CIL* vi 25427.15–26): see 35–6n., and cf. also Plaut. *Merc.* 823–5. The gesture is intensified by *contentus* . . . *umbra, tanti cineres* . . . *esse*.

Paullus probably married subsequently the younger Marcella, sister of Marcellus; if 65–6 are spurious, it becomes less clear whether this was after 12 BC. Cf. *CIL* vi.2 pp. 909–10, vi 9000, x 5981, J. Scheid, *BCH* 100 (1976) 490, Syme (1986) 147–52 and tab. V, *Roman papers* vi (Oxford 1991) 259–61. In 85–94 P. politely leaves Paullus' options open.

93–4 C.'s love for Paullus, by contrast with 91–2, is conveyed indirectly, through her concern and the children's actions. *discite* . . . *iam nunc* implies her own wisdom (Ov. *AA* 3.59 shows *iam nunc* does not go with *uenturam*; *sentire* (Ω) would imply the old age was their own). The children replace the individual's philosophical softening of present or future old age for himself (Cic. *Cato* 2, Diog. Oen. fr. 138–9 Smith etc.; cf. J. G. F. Powell, *Cicero*, *Cato Maior de senectute*

(Cambridge 1988) 24–30, M. Smith, *Diogenes of Oenoanda* (Naples 1993) 566–70, with *Supplement* (Naples 2003) 130–9). Cf. the paradox of 96 *iuuet esse senem*. Paullus will have been about forty-nine to fifty-five at the death.

caelibis: any man without a wife. The pros and cons of this state were of course debatable (Cic. *Att.* 14.13.5 *libero lectulo*, Hor. *Epist.* 1.1.87–9 etc.); but *caelibis* evokes Augustus' recent and controversial legislation (Tac. *Ann.* 3.25.1, Gaius *Inst.* 2.144; Livy *Epit.* 59). The *turba* of children is to block all the roads to care (cf. Bassus *AP* 7.391.1–2 (*GP* 1607–8)); the image contrasts with the loneliness of being unmarried, a condition typically accompanied by childlessness.

95–8 The wish in 95, for the total of C.'s lost years to be added to their lives, is voiced by the dead wife of her husband at *CIL* VI 12652.023–6. It appears as a generous impossibility at e.g. Ov. *Met.* 7.164–74. But two particular stories of self-sacrifice are in the background of 95–8. (1) Alcestis is connected with the motif at *Alc. Barc.* 75–6 (cf. 29), and, by the nature of the scene, at Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.177–8. Alcestis did for her husband what Admetus' parents would not for their son (cf. Plato *Smp.* 179b4–c3); the transference of the motif here to mother and children shows C.'s reticence on conjugal love – the more so as Paullus has been Admetus at 83–4, 91–2. (2) Aemilius Paullus, who came at 39–40, is recalled here by *bene habet* at 97: he used the phrase nobly about his sacrifice of his children and house for the state (*ORF* 12 F 2, cf. Livy 45.40.6–42.1, Plut. *Aem.* 34.5–37.1). C., with different priorities from Aemilius, is noble about herself in relation to her children. His spectacular loss of his children is a poignant foil to 96, where *Paullum* is used significantly: cf. Livy 45.41.12 *Paullus in domo praeter sen nemo superest. fregit . . . domos* in 40 acquires poignancy too.

Placing 97–8 after 62 (Peerlkamp) breaks these links, and enfeebles *bene habet*, typically an arresting phrase (cf. e.g. Livy 39.50.8, Sen. *Oed.* 998; Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.26). 96 joins to 91–4; *sic* takes up 95 (96 is 'with this condition met, thanks to my children Paullus would find pleasure in being old'). *et bene habet* takes up C.'s predeceasing the children, implicit in 95; it is justified from the children's viewpoint, and, with a tactful turn, her own. Joy in the survival of children links 95–6 and 97–8. The causal *prole* involves beyond simple survival the ideas of their growing up, their successes (70) and their affection (93–4). For the felicity of being buried by one's children (98) cf. e.g. Posid. 61.5–6 A–B, Vell. 1.11.6–7 (Q. Metellus Macedonicus (*cos.* 143)); for the special pain of mothers burying children cf. e.g. Cat. 39.4–6, *AE* 1999 no. 969.2–6 (4th cent. AD), 2000 no. 331.6–7 (1st cent. AD). *AP* 7.224 presents a similar claim to C.'s, by a supposed 105-year-old mother of 29.

99–100 suddenly return to defence. Those who had been witnesses are now told to weep: a role for children, especially, in the emotive finale to a speech (which *causa perorata est* could precede: Cic. *Quinct.* 91, *Cacl.* 70). Cf. Quint. *Inst.* 6.1.30, 41, Hermog. *Stas.* p. 52.17–18 Rabe, Whitehead on Hyper. *Phil.* 9. For *surgite* cf. e.g. Sen. *Rh. Con.* 1.1.8, 7.4.9. *dum . . . rependat* (ς: -it Ω) means 'until', with a shade of intention, cf. e.g. Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.20, Virg. *Aen.* 1.5–6, Ov. *Met.* 11.254.

The lines belong here, not earlier (cf. Goold (1966) 100–1): *humus* links to *et caelum* 101, *grata rependat* to *digna merendo*. But if they were deleted (suspected by Hutchinson), we would be saved making C.'s instructions (72–98) part of her defence or a curious digression. Just before, 69–70 show the river(s) not yet crossed: too soon for a trial. Without 99–100, the defence has an ambiguous status: C. can be seen as imagining what she will say. The defence would fade out of the poem, like Lynceus' treachery in 2.34. The interpolator would be tying up loose ends. Internal points: *humus* is vague in this situation; the word could not denote the underworld, and *grata rependat* shows it means earth as opposed to *caelum*. *flentes surgite dum* for *flete dum* is lax.

101–2 Latin epitaphs, following Greek, can assign heaven to their dead, not just Elysium: cf. e.g. *CIL* VIII 8567.6 with *SGO* I 03/02/67 (c. 3rd cent. AD); *CIL* VI 21521 (*ML* 183) with *SGO* I 04/05/07. But *patuit*, 'has been open, so can be' (cf. N–R on Hor. C. 3.3.29–30), suggests exacting selection. In mind are: Enn. fr. 44.3–4 Courtney (*caeli* . . . *porta patet* for Scipio Africanus alone if anyone); Cic. *Rep.* 6.26 *bene meritis de patria quasi limes ad caeli aditum patet*, and the whole dream, where one Scipio meets another in heaven. C.'s *gens* is emphasized by *avis*, which *caelum* demands; *Epic. Drusi* 330 *honoratos* . . . *avos* (similar context) confirms. For the dat. cf. e.g. 1.20.32, 3.16.1, Stat. *Theb.* 2.654; for *uehantur* Ov. *Met.* 14.127 (to upper world), *Tr.* 5.3.19 (to skies). *ossa* of the dead person extends 20, 37, 58, 4.5.4, and would connect with 97–8 if 99–100 were removed. It is made highly paradoxical by the emphasis on fleeing the body in Cic. *Rep.* 6.14, 16, 26.2–29, P. 3.18.31–4 (31–2 are daring on body and soul in another fashion). Cynthia has very different ideas for her bones at the end of her speech (4.7.94 *mixtis ossibus ossa teram*).

patuit contrasts heaven with the closed Hades of 1–8, the more so without 99–100.

The second half-sentence is probably not a wish, somewhat like *SGO* II 09/09/17 r 16: *sim* (Ω) is not 'may I be judged'. Rather, *sum* (Fruter): a proud assertion (and, with 99–100, an *a fortiori* argument). The male domination of the heavenly dead (cf. Man. 1.780) makes this claim the more striking. These dead often have a separate place in the heavens from the gods; but they still infringe the firm boundaries of god and mortal (cf. e.g. *CIL* I² 2997.8 *corpore consumpt[o] uiua anima deus sum*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following lists the editions of and commentaries on Propertius 4 consulted and those works cited by name of author and date. For bibliography on book 4 in general see Introduction n. 3; for bibliographies on individual poems, see the introductions to those poems.

1. EDITIONS AND COMMENTARIES

- Burmannus, P. *Secundus Sex. Aurelii Propertii elegiarum libri IV* (Utrecht 1780) [notes on 4.11 are by L. Santen].
- Lachmann, K. *Sex. Aurelii Propertii carmina* (Leipzig 1816).
- Hertzberg, W. A. B. *Sex. Aurelii Propertii elegiarum libri quattuor*, 4 vols. (Halle 1843–5).
- Paley, F. A. *Sex. Aurelii Propertii carmina. The elegies of Propertius, with English notes*, 2nd edn. (London 1872).
- Baehrens, E. *Sexti Propertii elegiarum libri iv* (Leipzig 1880).
- Postgate, J. P. *Select elegies of Propertius*, 2nd edn. (London 1884).
- in J. P. Postgate (ed.). *Corpus poetarum Latinorum* 1 (London 1894) 287–321**.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. *Propertiana* (Cambridge 1956) [selective notes].
- Rothstein, M. *Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius*, 2nd edn., 2 vols. (Berlin 1920–4).
- Richmond, O. L. *Sexti Properti quae supersunt* (Cambridge 1928).
- Butler, H. E. and Barber, E. A. *The elegies of Propertius* (Oxford 1933).
- Barber, E. A. *Sexti Properti carmina*, 2nd edn. (Oxford 1960).
- Camps, W. A. *Propertius: elegies book IV* (Cambridge 1965).
- Fedeli, P. *Properzio. Elegie libro IV* (Bari 1965).
- Pasoli, E. *Sesto Properzio. Il libro quarto delle elegie*, 2nd edn. (Bologna 1967).
- Richardson, L., Jr *Propertius: elegies I–IV* (Norman 1977).
- Hanslik, R. *Sex. Propertii elegiarum libri IV* (Leipzig 1979).
- Fedeli, P. *Sexti Properti elegiarum libri IV* (Stuttgart 1984).
- Goold, G. P. *Propertius: elegies*, rev. edn. (Cambridge, Mass. and London 1999).
- Heyworth, S. J. (not yet published; see Preface).

2. OTHER WORKS

- Adams, J. N. (1994), *Wackernagel's Law and the placement of the copula esse in classical Latin* (PCPS Supplementary volume 18, Cambridge).
- Beard, M., North, J. and Price, S. (1998), *Religions of Rome*, 2 vols. (Cambridge).
- Boldrer, F. (1999), *L'elegia di Vertumno (Properzio 4.2)* (Amsterdam).
- Brouwer, H. H. J. (1989), *Bona Dea. The sources and a description of the cult* (Leiden).
- Butrica, J. L. (1984), *The manuscript tradition of Propertius* (Phoenix Supplement 17, Toronto).

- Carettoni, G. (1983), *Das Haus des Augustus auf dem Palatin* (Mainz am Rhein).
- Coutelle, E. (2005), *Poétique et métapoésie chez Propertius. De l'Ars amandi à l'Ars scribendi* (Louvain).
- DeBrohun, J. B. (2003), *Roman Propertius and the reinvention of elegy* (Ann Arbor).
- Fox, M. (1996), *Roman historical myths. The regal period in Augustan literature* (Oxford).
- Goold, G. P. (1966), 'Noctes Propertianae', *HSCP* 71: 59–106 (for 'Goold' without date see 1 above).
- Heyworth, S. J. (1986), 'Notes on Propertius books III and IV', *CQ* n.s. 36: 199–211 (for 'Heyworth' without date see 1 above).
- (1999), 'Textual notes on Propertius 4.3, 4.4, 4.5' in S. Morton Braund and R. Mayer (edd.), *Amor: Roma: love and Latin literature. Eleven essays (and one poem) presented to E. J. Kenney on his seventy-fifth birthday* (PCPS Supplement volume 22, Cambridge) 71–93.
- Housman, A. E. (1972), *The classical papers*, 3 vols. (Cambridge).
- Hubbard, M. (1974), *Propertius* (London).
- Janan, M. (2001), *The politics of desire. Propertius IV* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London).
- Jannot, J.-P. (1998), *Devins, dieux et démons. Regards sur la religion de l'Etrurie antique* (Paris).
- Latte, K. (1960), *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (Munich).
- Leumann, M. (1977), *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* (Munich).
- Maltby, R. (1991), *A lexicon of ancient Latin etymologies* (Leeds).
- Marr, J. L. (1970), 'Notes on Propertius 4. 1 and 4. 4', *CQ* n.s. 20: 160–73.
- McGinn, T. A. J. (1998), *Prostitution, sexuality, and the law in ancient Rome* (New York and Oxford).
- (2004), *The economy of prostitution in the Roman world. A study of social history and the brothel* (Ann Arbor).
- Miller, P. A. (2004), *Subjecting verses. Latin love elegy and the emergence of the real* (Princeton and Oxford).
- Mommsen, Th. (1887–8), *Römisches Staatsrecht*, 3rd edn., 3 vols. (Leipzig).
- Montanari Caldini, R. (1981), *Horos e Properzio, ovvero l'ispirazione necessaria* (Florence).
- Murgia, C. E. (1989), 'Propertius 4.1.87–88 and the division of 4.1', *HSCP* 92: 257–72.
- Pillinger, H. E. (1969), 'Some Callimachean influences on Propertius, book 4', *HSCP* 73: 171–99.
- Platnauer, M. (1951), *Latin elegiac verse. A study of the metrical usages of Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid* (Cambridge).
- Rambaux, Cl. (2001), *Propertius ou les difficultés de l'émancipation féminine* (Collection Latomus 261, Brussels).
- Ritter, St. (1995), *Hercules in der römischen Kunst von den Anfängen bis Augustus* (Heidelberg).
- Sebesta, J. L. and Bonfante, L. (edd.) (1994), *The world of Roman costume* (Wisconsin).

- Stahl, H.-P. (1985), *Propertius: 'love' and 'war'. Individual and state under Augustus* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London).
- Syme, R. (1986), *The Augustan aristocracy* (Oxford).
- Untermann, J. (2000), *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen* (Heidelberg).
- Williams, G. (1968), *Tradition and originality in Roman poetry* (Oxford).
- Wills, J. (1996), *Repetition in Latin poetry. Figures of allusion* (Oxford).
- Wissowa, G. (1912), *Religion und Kultus der Römer* (Munich).
- Wyke, M. (2002), *The Roman mistress. Ancient and modern representations* (Oxford).

INDEXES

‘21’ denotes p. 21 of the Introduction, ‘2.2’ the note on 4.2.2, ‘5 intro., 1, 6’ the introduction to 4.5 and the notes on 4.5.1 and 4.5.6.

1. Latin words

- accipio*, 2.2
adamas, 11.4
aequo, 11.31
Alcides, 9.37–8
aliquis, 6.81–2
amor, 4.37–8; (of parents), 4.53
Amphitryoniades, 9.1
animus, 1.45
ansa, 1.141–2
antrum, 4.3
aperio, 1.42
at (with command), 1.135; (after cond.), 7.29–30; (after neg.), 11.19; (postponed), 1.95–6; (+ pron.), 2.47–8
atque (+ cons.), 2.52

bene habet, 11.95–8
blandior, 6.72
blandus, 6.5

cantamen, 4.51
compitum, 1.23, 3.57–8
confiteor, 6.79
conuenio, 4.81–2
conuiuium, 6.71
Cous, 2.23–4
credo (*credidi*), 2.11–12
crimen, 11.45
cum (inverted), 8.49; (+ subj.), 1.129–30

deliciae, 7.75
desiderium, 3.28
do, 1.111–12, 3.26
dulcis, 11.55
dum, 11.99–100
durus, 2.23–4

ecce, 7.57–60
eo (verb), 1.8
et (placing), 5.27–8
exuium, 10.5–6

facio (*fac* + subj.), 4.66
fallo, 5.13–14
faueo, 6.1

festum, 4.73
fides, 21, 1.79–80, 3.11, 4.87, 6.57, 7 intro., 13; (play with *fides* ‘lyre’), 1.79–80, 7.61–2
figura, 2.21–2
foedus, 21, 3.69
for, 4.2

genius, 8.69
glaucus, 9.29
gloria, 3.63

habeo, 11.13–14
hactenus, 1.119
hic (pron.), 1.5, 3.38; (*hoc* in parenthesis), 6.63–4
hirsutus, 1.61–2, 4.27–8

implico, 11.15–16
imprudens, 1.71–2
in (+ acc.), 3.47–8
ingero, 5.35–6
insequor, 10.23
intermitto, 4.80
is (*eius*), 2.35–6, 6.67–8

Latinus, 6.45–6
lena, 5 intro.
leno, 5 intro.
lex, 3.70, 4.57–8, 11.41
licet, 11.5–6
lucumo, 2.49–54

malus, 4. [17–18]
mandatum, 3.1
medius, 4.59–60
militia, 1.137–8
minus (word-order), 1.33
misceo, 7.93–4
modo (+ imper.), 2.19–20; (+ perf.), 7.39
moecha, 5.43–4
mollis, *mollio*, 2.23–4, 3.43, 4.62, 5.5, 6.5, 10, 71, 7.79–80, 9.49–50, 11.18, 41
morior, 3.5–6
Musa, 4.51

namque, 1.57-8
nempe, 11.5-6

omnis (omnia), 3.53, 4.85; (shameless),
8.30
opus, 2.64
ordo (with numerals), 4.77-8

parco, 9.53
parcus, 3.59-60
pars, 3.55-6
pater (of gods), 9.71-2
pendeo, 7.5
pio, 1.49-50
plastrum, 2.2 n. 38
pollex, 5.73-4
pono (-*postus*), 2.29
probo (*probatus*), 2.41-2
produco, 1.89-90
prosterno (*prostratus*), 8.69

qualis, 1.20
quantus, 6.65
quasillum, 7.41-2
quicumque (*quod*- + *gen.*), 1.59-60
Quirites, 8.59-60
quondam (+ *perf.*), 2.27-8

rapio, 4.57-8
ruo, 1.71-2

salua, 8.38
sanctus, 9.71-2
sarcina, 3.46

sed (+ *imper.*), 2.55-6, 5.63-5, 7.71
si (postponed), 3.2
sic (with *wish*), 3.67
signo, 1.145-6
signum, 1.81-8, 2.2
sin, 9.45-6
soluo, 4.79
soror, 11.59
spectaculum, 8.21-2
stola, 11.61-2
sub ('in' house), 4.55
sum (after *caes.*), 2.33-4; (initial), 2.[35-6],
 4.3-6, 6.59-60, 7.1
surdus, 5.58
suus (in letters), 3.1

tantum (tanti), 3.63
tempestas ('time'), 9.1
tempus ('opportunity'), 4.81-2, 6.53-4
teneo (*obj. husbands*), 11.67-8
tenuis, 1.127-8
tero, 7.93-4
turma, 4.31

uaco, 6.14
uales, 1.75-6, 6.1
uersus, 1.57-8
uersus, 1.107-8
uicinus, 8.1-2
uigilax, 7.15
uindex, 6.27
uncus, 1.141-2

zona, 1.107-8

2. General

Acanthis, 5 intro., 1, 6, 63-5
 Actium, 6 intro., 17-18, 25, 47-8
 Aemilius Lepidus, Paullus (*cos. suff.* 34), 11
 intro., 41, 91-2, 93-4
 Aemilius Paullus, L. (*cos.* 182), 11 intro.,
 39-40, 79-80, 95-8
 Aeneas, 1.41-4, 43, 9.4; narrator as,
1.57-8
 aetiology, *11-12*, 2 intro., 6 intro., 7 intro.,
 8 intro., 9 intro., 19-20; alternatives,
2.11-12, 10.47-8; and statues, 2.57-64
 Alba, 6.37-8
 Alcestis, 11 intro., 75, 85-6, 95-8
 allegory, 6.1-14
 altars, 9.56
 Amazons, 3.43
 Anacreon, 8.31, 57-8

Andromeda, 7.63-70
 Antony, 6 intro.
 Apollo, 1 intro., 6 intro., 31, 70
 Apollonius, 9 intro., 33-50
 apostrophe, 1.39-40, 51-4, 55-6, 4.31-4,
5.76, 8.70, 10.5-6, 27-8, 11.23-4, 38,
 51-2, 55
 apposition, inserted, 7.64, 9.3
 Ara Maxima, 9 intro., 36, 67-8
 Archytas, 1.77-8
 Arethusa, 3 intro., 1
 arms, 1.27-8, 29, 6.26, 10.21-2, 39-44
 army, 1.95-6, 3 intro., 45
 Assisi, 1.[125-6], 129-30
 astrology, 1 intro., 75-6, 77-8, 89-90,
 107-8, 121-50, 147-50, 2.21-48
 augury, 1.105

Augustus: and army, 3 intro.; and censorship, 11.41; conquests, 2-3, 3.7-10, 6.77-8; and cults, 6 intro., 9 intro.; family, 11 intro., 55-60; legislation, 8 intro., 76-7, 9.63-4, 11 intro., 47-8, 57-8, 61-2, 93-4; as Octavian, 5, 1.129-30, 6 intro., 11.55-60; and Palatine, 1.3-4, 6 intro., 10; and poets, 5-6; return, 4, 3.71-2; rule, 6.39-40; and senate, 1.11-14; and *spolia opima*, 10 intro.; and state, 6.27-8; and tradition, 3-4, 11.41-4

Bacchus, 6.75-6, 7.61-2
Basilica Pauli, 4 intro., 57-62, 91
beds, 4.90, 7.6, 8.87-8, 11.85-6; *see also* couches
birthdays, 5.35-6
bodies, 2.1
Bona Dea, 9 intro., 23, 56
bones, 1.127-8, 3.20, 7.93-4, 11.101-2
brevity: and power, 4.90; *see also* elegy
burial, 5.75-8, 7.4, 11.95-8

Cacus, 9.7-10
Caesar, *see* Julius Caesar
Callimachus: *Aet.*, 10-13, 18-19, 1 intro., 57-8, 133-4, 2.11, 6 intro., 10, 9 intro., 33-50; *Ep.*, 19, 11 intro.; *Hymns*, 9.22, 57-8, 10.37-8; aesthetic, 1.63-4, 8 intro.; and elegy, 1.8-10, 6.3-4; on statues, 2 intro.
Capitol, 1.51, 7, 4.2, 4.8
Cassandra, 1.51-4, 117-18
censorship, 11.41-4, 41
Cerberus, 5.3-4, 7.89-90, 11.25-6
cherries, 2.15-16
children, 11.95-8, 99-100
Chloris, 7.72
chronology, 1-2, 8 intro.
Cicero: *Fam.*, 3.3-4; *Ver.*, 3.23-8, 11.73-4
Cinara, 1.99
Claudia Quinta, 11.51-2
Claudius Marcellus, C. (Augustus' nephew), 6, 10.39-44, 11 intro.
Cleopatra, 6 intro., 2.1, 63-4, 65
Clodius Pulcher, P. (*tr. pl.* 58), 9 intro., 25-6, 53
closure, 17, 21, 7 intro., 9.71-2, 11 intro., 1
comedy, 5 intro., 43-4, 49-50
conditional (only formal), 1.49-54
Conon, 1.77-8
continuity, 1-21, 10 intro., 11 intro.
Cornelia (wife of Paullus *cos. suff.* 34), 17, 11 intro., 65-6

Cornelii Scipiones, 11 intro., 27, 37, 43-4, 69-70, 101-2
Cornelius Cossus, A. (*cos.* 428 or 427), 10 intro.
Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus, P. (*cos.* 147), 11.29-30
Cos, 5.23
couches, 5.24, 8.35-6, 68
country, 1.23, 25-6, 30, 61-2, 2.21-48, 4 intro., 9.16, 10.29-30
Curia, 1.11-14
Cynthia, 7, 8.16-17, 1.139-40, 5 intro., 7 intro., 7-12, 15-20, 23-34, 8 intro., 11 intro., 85-6

dativ: for gen., 4.44; of motion, 1.148, 11.101-2
deafness (figurative), 11.5-6
death, 16; described, 4.91, 5.67-70, 7 intro.; *see also* underworld
dining, 8.35-6
discontinuity, 1-21
dogs, 3.55-6, 5.73-4, 7.89-90, 8.23-4, 11.25-6
doors, 5.47-8, 8.84, 9.14, 53-60, 61-2, 11.2
dowry, 4.56, 92
dreams, 4.65, 69, 7.5-6
dwarfs, 8.41

elegy: aetiological, 1 intro., 6 intro., 7 intro.; in book 3, 8-9; brevity, 2 intro., 10 intro.; characters, 5 intro.; Cos and, 5.23; deceit, 5.15-16; and epic, 19, 2.53-4, 9.57-8; ethos, 9, 17, 2.23-4; Hellenistic, 10, 4.39-42; history of, 8-10, 2.27-8; ideas of, 8-10, 16-19, 1.119, 135-46, 2.43-4; and lament, 10, 19, 7 intro., 11 intro.; masculinity in, 10 intro.; narrator, 9; and other genres, 8 intro.; and sexes, 3 intro.; and smallness, 1.59-60, 10 intro., 3-4; and war, 4.62

Elysium, 7.61-2, 11.49-50

Ennius, 1.61-2

epic, 1.7, 4.68, 8 intro.; *see also* elegy

epigram, 12, 1.89-104, 99-102, 2 intro., 33-4; book as, 1.1; sepulchral, 5.1, 6.83-4, 7 intro., 11 intro.

Esquiline, 8.1-2, 59-60

Etruscans: army, 2.49-54; gods, 2 intro., 2.3-4; haruspicy, 1.104; Lycmon, 1.29; *sellae*, 10.27-8; Veii, 10 intro., 23

etymology, 2.7-10, 11-12, 4.93, 9.5-6, 10 intro., 47-8

- Euripides, 11 intro., 75
 Evander, 1.3-4
 examples, 4.39-42, 43, 5.41-4,
 11.41-4
 Fama, 2.19-20
 family, 11 intro., 35-6
 forum, 1.13-4, 2 intro., 29, 4.14, 8.76-7;
 Forum Boarium, 9.19-20
 funerals, 1.127-8, 3.16, 5.71, 7.27-8, 32,
 11.9, 11-12, 13-14
 gardens, 2.11-18, 41-2
 Gauls, 10.39-44
 gender: in book 4, 9 intro.; confused,
 3.23-8; indeterminate, 2.23-4;
 inverted, 8 intro., 73-82, 9.49, 47-50;
 see also women
 genitive: adj. in, with poss. pron., 4.59-60;
 exclamation?, 7.21-2; reference, 4.87
 gerundive: meanings, 4.29
 ghosts, 7.1, 87-92; metaliterary, 7 intro.
 gladiators, 8.25
 glass, 8.37
 gods, 12, 13, 1 intro., 2 intro., 2; apotheosis,
 5, 6.59-60, 9 intro., 11.60; authority, 4
 intro.; oaths by, 5.27-8; philosophical,
 3.38; punishment by, 4.69, 5.65-6;
 vivid, 10 intro.
 haruspicy, 1.104
 Hercules, 9 intro., 7, 47-50, 61-2, 69
 Hermes, 2 intro.
 Hippolytus, 5.5
 historiography, 4.81-2, 6.19-24, 8.15-16,
 10.39-44
 Homer, 5.7, 6.33-4, 7 intro., 8 intro.,
 43-4, 53-4, 9.23, 33-50, 11.79-80
 Horace: *Odes*, 1.63-4, 7.45-6, 8 intro., 38;
 Odes 4, 5-6, 7; *Carm. Saec.*, 6 intro.;
 Cinara in, 1.99
 Horos, 1 intro., 77-8, 119
 houses, 19-20, 5 intro., 73-4, 7 intro.,
 35-46, 8.83-6, 11.77-8, 79-80
 hydromancy, 1.106
 Hypermestra, 7.63-70
 illusion (artistic), 2.26, 31-2
 indicative (in *or. obl.*), 2.11-12
 inscriptions, 12, 1.1, 2 intro., 1, 57-8,
 3.71-2, 11 intro., 38, 89-90; epitaphs, 11
 intro., 1, 10, 13-14, 17, 19, 35-6, 55,
 73-4, 101-2; P in, 5.47-8
 Iphigenia, 1.109-10, 111-12
 Isis, 5.33-4
 judges, 11.19, 19-20
 Julius Caesar, C. (dictator), 6.59-60
 Julius Caesar, C. and L. (Augustus'
 adopted sons), 3, 11.59
 Juno: and Hercules, 9.43-4, 71-2; Lucina,
 1.99-102; Sospita, 8.3-14, 15-16
 Jupiter, 2.55-6, 4.86, 6.14, 23-4, 9.67-8;
 Feretrius, 1.7, 4.2, 10 intro.
 lamps, 8.85
 Lanuvium, 8.3-14
 laurel, 6.10, 53-4
 legal language, 8.73-82, 81
 letters, 3 intro., 1, 3-4, 71-2
 literary history: elegy 2.27-8; Roman,
 1.61-2
 Livy, 4-5, 9.4, 12, 10 intro., 5-22
 Lollius, M. (*cos.* 21), 1.95-6
 love: initiative in, 5.41-2; and metaphor, 8
 intro., 66; violence in, 5.31-2, 8.63; see
 also oaths
 Lupericalia, 1.25-6
 Lupercus, 1.93-4
 luxury, 3.51, 4.21, 5.21-8, 6.73-4, 8.15-16,
 37
 Lycmon, 1.29
 Lycotas, 3.1
 Lygdamus, 7.35-46
 Maecenas, 5-6, 8.1-2
 magic, 5 intro., 11-12, 7.72
 Mamurius, 2.59-62
 mannerism, 6 intro.
 manuscripts, 22-3
 maps, 3.37
 Marcellus, see Claudius
 marriage, 3 intro., 13-16, 4 intro., 33-4,
 11.67-8; and adultery, 8 intro., 11.45;
 emotion in, 11 intro., 55; grief for
 spouse, 11.81-2; *uniuius*, 11.35-6; see also
 weddings
 masculinity, 17, 4.62, 8 intro., 17, 67, 9.31,
 39, 71-2, 10 intro.
 Medea, 5.41-2
 metapoetic language, 17, 1.147-50, 2.1,
 27-8, 6.1-14, 5, 11.13-14
 metatextual language, 9.71-2
 metre: in book 4, 15-16; caes. in hex., 5.21;
 end of pent., 15-16, 5.27-8; feet 2-4 in
 hex., 7.41-2; second half of pent., 4.73,
 7.88
 Mevania, 1.123-4
 middles, 7 intro.
 mime, 7.35-46, 8 intro.
 monologue, 4 intro., 31-66

- mothers, 4.53
Muses, 13, 4.51, 6.11–12
- names: Greek 3.1; use of own, 9.17, 39, 11.13–14
- narrative, 12, 18, 1 intro., 3 intro., 4 intro., 3–6, 73–8, 5 intro., 6 intro., 7 intro., 35–46, 8 intro., 9 intro., 14, 10.5–22, 23–38
- narrator, 8, 13; in *Aetia*, 13; changes in, 4.62; life of, 1.121–50, 5.73–4, 7 intro., 11 intro.; overstates, 10.29–30; unreliable, 5 intro., 17–18
- night, 3.29, 31–2, 4.94, 6.85–6, 7.89–94
- nominative plural (-i for -ii), 1.34
- nouns (in books 3 and 4), 14
- Numa, 2.59–62, 10 intro.
- nurses, 1.55–6, 3.41–2, 7.73
- oaths, 21, 11.27; in love, 21, 5.27–8, 7.21–2, 51–4, 8.73–82
- objects (in book 4), 12, 14
- Omphale, 9.47–50
- openings, 1.55–6, 3.1, 71–2, 4.31–4, 5.1–4, 21–8, 7 intro., 13, 10.1
- Orpheus, 11.5–6, 7–8
- Ovid, 7; *Her.*, 3 intro.; *Am.*, 5 intro.
- Palatine, 1.3–4, 5, 6 intro., 43–4, 9.3
- panegyric, 6 intro.
- Parilia, 1.19–22, 4.73–8
- Parthia, 4, 3 intro., 7–10, 7–8, 64, 66, 6.79–80
- participle (conditional), 1.73–4
- pastoral, 9.16
- Penates, 1.39–40, 91
- Penelope, 5.7
- perfect, 2.27–8, 11.32; -it, 1.17–18
- Perseus (king of Macedonia), 11.39–40
- Philetas, 8–9, 6.3–4
- Phyllis, 8.29
- pillars, 7.81–6
- Pindar, 2.19–20
- Plato, 11 intro.
- pluperfect (for perf. or impf.), 8.82, 9.28
- plural (for sing.), 1.45, 2.2, 4.11–12, 9.34
- poisoning, 7.35–46
- Pompey, porticoes of, 8.75
- Posidippus, 10, 11 n. 19
- possessive pronouns (objective), 8.67
- present (for past), 4.54
- prologues, 1 intro.
- Propertius: life and *œuvre*, 7–16, 1.131–2; name, 1.121–2
- prosody (-ē *sp.*, etc.), 4.48, 7.51
prosopopoeia, 3 intro.
- prostitution, 5 intro., 7 intro., 15–20, 40
- Romulus, 3, 10, 21, 1.5, 9, 25–6, 4 intro., 53, 6.21, 43–4, 8.31, 10 intro., 5–22, 17
- roses, 2.39–40, 5.61–2, 7.60, 8.40
- Sabines, 4 intro., 21, 32; women, 4.57–62
- sacrifice, 1 intro., 109–10, 3.61–2, 6.2, 5, 7–8, 7.34, 10.15–16
- sailors, 5.49–50
- Sancus, 9.71–2
- Scipios, *see* Corneli Scipiones
- Scribonia (wife of Augustus), 11.55–60
- Scribonii Libones, 11.31
- Scylla, 4 intro., 39–40
- seeing: by men, 9.53; by women, 3 intro., 4 intro., 66
- Servius Tullius, 1.23, 4.53
- slavery, 1.144, 4.33–4, 9.47
- slaves: affection to, 7.75; names, 5.35–6, 7.35–46, 8.29; sale of, 5.51–2
- snakes, 8.8
- soldiers, 5.49–50
- space, 19–20, 7 intro.
- speeches, 16–17, 4 intro., 5 intro., 6 intro., 9.33–50, 11 intro.; exhortatory, 6.37–54
- spolia opima*, 10 intro., 5–6, 9–10
- statues, 2 intro., 2, 37, 57–64, 59–62; portrait, 7.47–8, 11.83–4
- stranger (in epigram, etc.), 1.1
- subjunctive: represents speech not in *or.* *obl.*, 4.88; impf. and plup. interchangeable, 9.43–4
- Subura, 7.15
- supplication, 8.71–2
- synonyms (different roles in same sentence), 4.49–50
- Tarpeia, 4 intro., 87
- Teia, 8.31
- theatres, 1.15–16, 8.76–7
- Tiber, 1.8, 2.7–10
- Tibullus, 7, 5 intro., 7 intro.
- Tibur, 7 intro., 29–30, 81–6, 81–2, 8 intro.
- toga picta*, 4.53
- tombs, 16, 4.1, 5.75–8, 7.81–6
- treachery, 4.89
- triumphs, 3–4, 1.31–2, 4.53, 6.65, 8.17, 11.11–12, 71–2
- Troy, 1.113–14, 6.37–8

- Umbria, 1.65-6, 121-2
 underworld, 5.3-4, 7.55-70, 61-2, 11
 intro., 19, 49-50
 unity, 1, 2.1
- Varro, 4, 1 intro., 9 intro.
 Veii, 10.23-38, 29-30
 Velabrum, 9.5-6
 Vertumnus, 2 intro.
 Vesta, 4.69
 Vestal Virgins, 4 intro., 44, 11.53-4
 Vicus Tuscus, 2 intro., 49-54
 Virдумarus, 10.41
 Virgil: *Ecl.*, 8.48, 9.15; *G.*, 2.14, 43-4; *Aen.*,
 6-7, 1.43, 8 intro., 10.11-12, 13-14,
 15-16, 46, 11.63-4; *Aen.* 6, 7.87-92; *Aen.*
 8, 4, 6 intro., 23-4, 9 intro., 67-8;
 career, 1.25-6
 vocabulary (in P), 14
 Volsinii, 2 intro., 3-4
 vow, 10.15-16
- war: civil, 6.52; curse on, 3.19-22; and
 greed, 1.97-8; and love, 1.135, 137-8,
 147-50, 3.12, 8.63
 wealth, 1.30, 2 intro., 5, 5 intro., 49-50, 7
 intro., 10 intro.
 weddings, 4.59-60, 11.33-4
 wills, 7.71-86
 wolf, 1.55-6, 4.53
 women: in book 4, 13, 1.49-54, 89-104;
 conflict with men, 17; costume, 8.61,
 11.33-4; and emotion, 11 intro.;
 fierceness, 3.23-8, 8.55-6; and gods,
 20-1; laughter, 9.23; in love-elegy, 3
 intro.; male roles, 6.22, 57 (*see also*
 gender); moral differentiation of, 21;
 persuasion by, 17; ritual exclusion of,
 9.69; social life of, 3.53-4; at spectacles,
 8.76-7; tears, 3.3-4, 4.45-6; waiting, 3
 intro.; and war, 1.97-8, 3 intro.;
 weaving, 3.33
 writing, 3 intro., 71-2; *see also* inscriptions